Anti-Semitism Spread By Dief Commissioner

By P. KENT

One of the three-man Royal Commission on Publications struck off by the Diefenbaker government and now deep in discussions on freedom of the press, the development of Canadian culture, etc., has turned out to be a purveyor ol anti-semitic filth on a syndicated basis.

Mr. J. George Johnston is head of Johnston, Everson and Charlesworth Ltd., one of Canada's largest public relations firms, which amongst other activities provides ready-made editorial material for publications that many corporations circulate amongst their employees. Most of the editorials that such firms plant on behalf of big business are viciously anti-labor. Amongst the clients of this company's two page publication called The Printed Word, are Consumers Gas and Steel Company of Canada.

One editorial just brought to the attention of the public by Steelworkers' public relations director Murray Cotterill, has been described by him as a "type of sniggering, supercilious, locker-room brand of anti-semitism." The editorial in question comments on what it alleges is Jewish Communist sympathy for Red China.

One of Mr. Johnston's associates first contacted by the press, a Mr. J. L. Charlesworth, dissociated himself from all responsibility for it, said contrary to usual practice he had not edited that issue, conceded that it was poorly expressed, denied that there had been any anti-semitic intent, but when informed of the Toronto and District Labor Council's reaction to Mr. Cotterill's exposure said; "It looks like they (an apparent reference to Jews, according to the reporter) have started an organized campaign against us."

As for Mr. Johnston himself, he shifted from claiming that he did not see it before publication because of his duties on the commission, to making a blanket denial that it is anti-semitic. He branded Cotterill's statement a "damn lie" and declared that he is suing Cotterill for slander and the Toronto Telegram, for its news coverage, for libel.

A confidential session of the Toronto Labor Conference on Human Rights a few days later heard a senior official of the federal government challenge that there is widespread discrimination against Jews in the Canadian banking business.

G. R. Carroll, director of the Canadian Fair Employment Practices Division of the Department of Labor, said; "I know they (the banks) most definitely do discriminate against Jews. Throughout the

See page 4—ANTI-SEMITISM

V

January, 1961

Workers' Vanguard #60

Anti-Semitism

(Continued from page 1)

whole banking business in Canada you will not find Jews." The few who get jobs in banks, he testified, will be found only in the lower levels.

He related an incident where the fair employment practices officer in Winnipeg raised a matter of discrimination by a certain manager to the attention of a head office. The manager was fired, he said, but not for discrimination but for discriminating publicly.

This evidence from an unimpeachable source was met with a lot of bluster by leading spokesmen of almost every chartered bank. But it was affirmed by the executive director of the Jewish Vocational Service who testified that in 13 years this specialized employment agency had "not succeeded in placing applicants in the chartered banks."

Mr. Diefenbaker has taken no action to remove Mr. Johnston from the Royal Commission on Publications nor has any government spokesman commented on the inability of government bodies, such as the Department of Labor FEP Division, to come to grips with discrimination in employment and what the government intends to do about it.

WHY, DESPITE CUBAN DESIRES, DID THEIR TRADE MISSION FAIL?

JAN / 61

By JEAN LAPLANTE

When Canada's Trade Minister George Hees met the Cuban trade delegation he warmly welcomed them with the statement; "You can't do business with better businessmen anywhere."

The delegation led by Cuban Economics Minister Regino Boti said that it had 3½ million dollars with which it would purchase goods. It sought no military equipment, no goods which have been labelled strategic, nor goods made in the US which in some way might by-pass the State Department's embargo and be transshipped to the tiny harassed republic via Canada. It sought goods produced here, such as auto parts from Toronto area manufacturers.

What with the fall off in Canadian export trade, throwing thousands of Canadian workers into unemployment, such trade could only be welcomed. But that is not how the Liberals and a widely diverse but highly vocal scattering of groups see it. They are whipping up a campaign that would not only make Canadian trade policies a carbon copy of the US State Department's but would drag the people of Canada behind the Pentagon's open sponsorship of gangs of counter-revolutionary crooks and gangsters preparatory to an imperialist intervention against the popular revolution led by Fidel Castro.

Long presented as symbolizing the best in liberalism, the eminent Liberal Party leader, Senator Croll, led the pack. He demanded that the Cuban trade mission "should be sent packing." While Canada is going full steam ahead towards the nuclear armament of its own military forces, Croll raised the bogey of Cuba becoming a Russian missile base. Trade with Cuba, he ranted—any kind of trade—would be "strengthening the hand of a regime which has brought communism to Cuba and helped establish a Red beachhead which could be used as a missile base. . . ."

To bolster up his argument he suggested that should we not comply to the US State department embargo against Cuba the State department may bring the Canadian economy to its knees by placing an embargo against Canadian goods going into the US. "Picking feathers from the American eagle may prove to be a dangerous pastime," he cried. He brazenly lied about the terms of sale of the Cuban assets of the Royal Bank of Canada to the Cuban government. "We were paid for Canadian goods with money confiscated from Canadians. What a sham! What a perfidy!"

Spokesmen for the Royal Bank informed the press that their firm was pleased with the transaction. "This is a negotiated settlement—they offered to buy our assets and take over our liabilities." Since then the Bank of Nova Scotia has sold its Cuban interests to the Cuban government. The statement of its president was as different as black from white from Croll's claims. The bank, he said, was "able to conclude satisfactory arrangements for the transfer of our Cuban business . . ."

Senator Croll's demand that Canada toe the US State Department's line is not at variance in any way with official Liberal policy. Liberal leader Pearson also urged blanket compliance with the US embargo against Cuba in his declaration in the house that Canadian trade with Cuba would "strengthen the force of Communist imperialism on the island."

No sooner did the US declare its embargo designed to bring the wheels of Cuban economy, patterned on US equipment, to a grinding halt, to promote hunger, disruption, and foster counter-revolution, than the Diefenbaker government assured the US that Canada would not be used as a backdoor for US manufacturers to circumvent the US trade embargo. He said no goods manufactured in the US would pass through Canada to embattled Cuba. The cabinet passed an amendment to the regulation under export and imports control legislation. This amendment lumps Cuba with all the countries in the Soviet areas, thereby depriving it of any goods and services that are declared to be strategic—now some 228 items. But these restrictions didn't satisfy the Liberals. Pearson attacked the government for not prohibiting all goods requiring an individual export licence.

High US government officials have made it publicly known that they strongly disapprove of the Canadian government's refusal to abjectly comply to their provocative actions against Cuba. This was done by leaking to the press, via the assistant secretary of commerce for international affairs, that the US secretary of state, Christian Herter, decried Canada's position in an exchange of letters with secretary of commerce Frederick Mueller. Now we are being barraged with expensive ads in the press, appealing to us as citizens to urge the government to make Canada party to the US embargo, published in the name of the "Economical Division of the Cuban Revolutionary Front." signed by what would appear to be heads of various business interests now in exile. Adding to the Hate Cuba campaign is the voice of the editor of the United Church Observer who warns "Businessmen should know that they may not get paid . . ."

Canada, while in many ways giving an appearance of non-compliance to the dictates of the US State Department, has not increased its trade with Cuba to any marked extent despite all the expressed intentions of the Cuban trade delegations. Prime Minister Diefenbaker, after ridiculing those who would restrict non-strategic goods to Cuba by pointing out that this would be imposing stricter control with Cuba than Canada has with the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc, gave a three point explanation of his government's policy.

He first ridiculed the idea that there would be any trade of any consequence, so in reality the whole stew was much ado about nothing. "There is no evidence at the present time that there is likely to be any dramatic or sustained increase in the volume of such trade," he told the press over the Christmas holidays, "even in the peaceful items of Canadian origin in which trade with Cuba is permissible." He then warned that Canada "as a country which lives by international trade, cannot lightly resort to the weapons of a trade war." He lastly expressed a variation on the theme that it was in the overall interests of Western capitalism's relations with the colonial peoples, particularly of South America, that Canada should maintain the appearance at least, of not being in American capitalism's vest pocket. To sum it up Canada's refusal to ape the US embargo is a cheap and useful gesture in the overall interests of the alliance of capitalist nations.

It is a fact, despite the US embargo and that the Canadian economy, geared to US standards, is best able of any nation in the world to meet the demands of the Cuban economy, that there has not been any marked increase in Canadian-Cuban trade. While the Cuban trade commission expressed intention of placing 3½ million dollars worth of orders it has been unofficially estimated that purchases reached the modest total of less than half a million dollars. Sales to Cuba, up in October, were down in November — with the 11 month total standing at $10,584,000 — a drop of $3,210,000.

According to the trade minister, the Cuban delegation assured him that they neither lacked dollars or credit, nor were they hampered by any need to trade by barter. But while Boti claimed Cuba had 150 million dollars in convertiblo currency to pay for Canadian goods, government officials scoffed that the Cuban banks had only 91 million in holdings and that if it paid outstanding obligations it would be half a million dollars in the hole. Unofficial reports have it that they did ask private firms for credit and were turned down—that all the propaganda circulating around about risk and the short term character of the market had its effect and that Canadian business' interest was lukewarm.

The Canadian people have every interest that Cuban-Canadian trade should expand and flourish. The less privation that the Cuban economy undergoes, the greater possibility that their revolutionary struggle, which has already resulted in such astonishing gains for the people, will unfold without bureaucratic distortions. Besides trade with Cuba will provide jobs for Canadians. That is why the government should be called upon to grant extensive long term credits or make other far reaching concessions to Cuba to promote trade and good will!

Don't Deprive It of Its Birthright - - Fight for - - - JAN '61

A SOCIALIST POLICY FOR NEW PARTY

The socialist viewpoint is under the most powerful attack that this country has ever witnessed. The capitalist opposition to socialism, the lies of the Liberals, Tories and Social Credit, the slanders and distortions over all the mediums of communications in their hands, have been persistent. But this anti-socialism has been losing its effect—the workers have developed a healthy scepticism—the bias of the source is becoming too obvious.

The anti-socialist campaign of today and the past five years is the more powerful, the more effective, the more damaging, in that its source is persons long identified in the public mind as being in some way socialist—the leadership of the now defunct CCF, attempting to find another base of operations in the new party.

Their campaign against socialism reached a peak five years ago with the dumping of the Regina Manifesto and the adoption of the Winnipeg Declaration by the CCF national convention. Now, in the discussions on the new party it is reaching a climax.

The crisis of the thirties and the wave of militant protest that it whipped up imposed on the Douglas' and Lewis' a radical ideology which since the opening of World War II they have been steadily divesting themselves of. They are now intent on assuring that the new party is launched without such encumbrances as opposition to wars waged to make the world safe for capitalism (in these days of Laos and intervention in Cuba) and commitment to the elimination of the domination and exploitation of one class by another and socialized planning (in these days of AVRO shutdowns, Elliott Lake and the evacuation of the Maritimes).

The irony of the situation is that whereas the conditions prevailing in 1956 favored the adoption of the peaceful co-existence with capitalism Winnipeg Declaration, the economic climate in Canada today is undergoing drastic change and doing violence to their concepts.

Douglas proclaims to the Montreal and Calgary new party seminars that the problems of the 60's are a good deal different than the 30's. New party MP Pitman protests that we mustn't fight the battles of the thirties. But the generation that fought those battles as they line up with a new generation for unemployment insurance, talk about mass jobless marches onto Ottawa, and hear CLC leader Claude Jodoin himself warn that this unemployment is chronic, cannot help but see more similarity than difference between the thirties and today.

Taking their lead from Galbraith, a superficial essayist and commentator on matters economic, and advisor to the Democratic US president-elect Kennedy, the new opponents of socialism declare that there is nothing organically wrong with the system under which we live. They have a positive reluctance to define the system as capitalism and when they do, like Douglas, they call it planned capitalism—different in some way, a decisive, even if not defined way, from what it was in the thirties.

They attack socialism at its roots. They attempt to deny that there is a conflict, a struggle between labor and capital, or at least one that is in any way irreconcilable. As Coldwell put it "the class struggle is dead." They challenge the concept that this system is one of crisis. The crisis confronting man in our times, they say, lies not in prevailing economic and social conditions, but in ourselves. According to Douglas, rather than new economic laws, we need a new sense of values.

Woodworker leader Joe Morris cut across these concepts in his report to the Calgary seminar when he assured those in attendance that trade unionists are well aware that labor is dealt with as a commodity . . . they fully realize the significance of the present class division of society on the basis of economic interests . . . not a day passes that they are not brought face to face with the class struggle in its ugliest and most ruthless form.

The question as to whether there is a class struggle and whether the economic system under which we live is one of crisis is not to be decided by freezing the picture at some particular moment, but by observing it as it unfolds before our eyes over a period of time. The Coldwell's and Lewis's stopped the film, which was limited to shots of North America at a period of relative stability, and said—see—this is the whole picture. But the reel is continuing to unwind.

The economic laws of capitalism, which Coldwell and Douglas had an impression of in the 30's, continue to operate. Capitalism remains, for all the tinkering, a system of crisis. The crises arise out of the private ownership of the means of production and the private acquisition of the goods produced by social labor for social consumption. Man is divided along class lines determined by his relations to the means of production—there are those who own means of production—capital—and those who only possess the ability to work at the means of production owned by others. Between these two forces there is a conflict

See page 3—THE NEW PARTY

to p. 2

THE WORKERS' VANGUARD #60

Published monthly by The Workers' Vanguard Publishing Association
81 Queen Street West, Toronto 1, Ont. — EM. 6-1454
EDITOR—ROSS DOWSON Subscriptions 50c a year (12 issues)

The policy of The Workers Vanguard is reflected in its editorials. Signed articles and features express the ideas of our contributors and do not necessarily represent the policies or opinion of The Workers' Vanguard.

Set up and printed by Merchants Press, 323 King St. W., Toronto
Authorized as Second Class matter, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Page 2 of 2

The New Party and Socialism

(Continued from page 1)

over the division of the fruits of labor. This struggle is the class struggle.

The class struggle is a fact, regardless of the particular forms or tempo that it takes on at any given time. If it were not so, there would be no unions. And if it were not so there would be no basis for the new party.

Great time and effort is being expended to deny that the new party is a class party. Although on occasion, particularly when they speak to working class audiences, the Douglas' refer to the Liberals, Tories and Social Credit as class parties, as parties of Big Business, of free enterprise—of capitalism. At the Montreal seminar, Steelworkers research director Harry Waisglass, expressed the hope that the new party will be neither socialist or free enterprise.

What is the new party then—a party of reform? But all the free enterprise parties, Liberals, Tory and Social Credit, are reform parties since they depend upon popular support to get elected. If the new party is to be only another party of reform it will not stand up before the siren calls of the Liberals. If it is neither socialist nor free enterprise, but a hermaphrodite—some kind of hybrid—it could start off in this state but if no operation takes place nature tells us that it will prove to be sterile.

It is no accident that while Gaitskell is attempting, and failing, to divest the British Labor party of its traditional policy of nationalization of the basic means of production, that Douglas and company are concentrating their fire on nationalization. Douglas calls it a fetish. Professor Weldon warns us against such cure-alls. The top leaders of the new party have found refuge in a rephrasing of the Mackenzie King formula—nationalization if necessary, but not necessarily nationalization. In place of nationalization—new economic laws—Douglas talks in terms of a new sense of values. He offers us no clue as to how the new sense of values is to be realized.

Make the New Party a Dynamic Alternative

Ironically, all this is presented as something new, alive, and vital. The concept of nationalization, plannification and industrial democracy, the class struggle, as old hat—the product of the thirties. But the views of Douglas and company not only predate Marxian socialism, timewise they are the product of an even more primitive stage of human thought. No one has claimed that public ownership is a cure-all. Derogative comments have been made that it is only a means. To be sure public ownership is only a means, but it is the only means yet suggested with which we can meet the problems of our times.

Capitalism, while having developed the highest level of production, is a system of waste and inefficiency. Not only through useless competition, and the alienation of man, but through the destruction of already existing productive plant. The steel industry in the US is running at only 40 per cent of its productive capacity. Across Canada whole industries are shut down or are on part time. Almost 13 per cent of the working force in the industrial Hamilton area is unemployed. The multi-million dollar Elliott Lake development is now deserted. Whole areas such as the Martimes are depressed, falling into disuse, and being abandoned.

The socialists seek to change the economic laws governing society and human relations, by bringing order and plan into production, through placing the key sectors, the commanding heights of the economy, under public ownership. Through councils of workers, farmers, housewives, with the aid of technicians, we would establish a genuine and meaningful democracy. Once collectively in control of the means whereby we live, we could develop higher, more efficient and benificent means.

What about the sense of values, the ethical and moral concepts that Douglas talks about? Isn't man's sense of values determined by conditions prevailing in his time. Aren't the prevailing concepts in society the ideas, a reflection of the interests, of the ruling class? Not only would public ownership eliminate the crisis in society through plannification, and remove all the areas of class conflict, since we would all be owners of the productive forces of the community, but it would lay down the material basis for a change in man's sense of values. Only by changing objective reality will man be able to change and rise to his true height.

For Nationalization of the Basic Industries

We no longer remain in the field of speculation as to whether nationalization is the path to the future. Today we are witness to the startling transformation, within one lifetime, of Soviet economy from one of the most backward in the world into the second most advanced. With the elimination of the bureaucracy and the full participation of the masses in every segment of society, Soviet progress would be even more impressive.

The new party should commit itself to nationalization of the basic means of production, to a fundamental transformation of social relations. It will be fighting for reforms in a period when the resistance of the capitalist class is mounting against those reforms already won, and when there is increasingly less possibility of establishing any new, extensive and lasting ones. The fight to defend the interests of the workers can only be directed at the powerhouse of capitalist resistance —their ownership of the means of production.

It is necessary to give the movement a broader, higher and more inspiring aim than defence and modest adjustments of the status quo. The vision of a new world of co-operative labor, the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, and the free development of the human personality, is not a deception like that perpetrated by Diefenbaker to manipulate our aspirations, but a practical realizability and a necessity. It is in harmony with the world-wide march of man.

It is not enough to talk about this in periodicals. It is necessary for socialists to attend the seminars and refute in debate, take on the superficialities and false positions expounded there, to frame resolutions to be submitted to the new party convention, and to gather their forces to commit new party clubs and CCF organizations to the socialist viewpoint.

It is vital that every effort be made now to get the party off on the right foot. Time is short. The socialist forces must organize. The resolution of this debate cannot be left to the blind forces of history but requires the conscious disciplined intervention of human beings.

Workers' Vanguard Mid-Feb. 1961 #61 — Editorials

Jobless Won't Fade Away Shorter Work-Week Answer

Mid Feb '61

With the first spring zephyr and the slightest falter in the sharply soaring unemployment figure we will be hearing all kinds of pious chatter. Unemployment will be presented as no longer the grave social question that it is, but a matter of concern to only the unemployed themselves.

But it will not be shoved aside so easily—should even a slight seasonal adjustment show up in the cold statistics of the unemployment insurance commission. Unemployment is not a temporary disease in the body of capitalism but an organic part of it. It is not a phenomenon associated with any particular season of the past year, or with any particular year of the past decade. In fact the situation confronting us has been building up for over a decade.

The work force in the CNR-CPR has dropped 19 per cent—from 179,315 in 1952 to 145,348 in 1959. Employment in the electrical industry is down 13,000 from 1956. Canadian textile mills which employed 97,000 in 1950 now employ 74,000.

Aside from the impact of over-capitalization, the loss of portions of the world market—automation—the twentieth century technological revolution—is gouging into the Canadian work force.

The Diefenbaker government has shoved aside any real responsibility in this matter. The high points in its efforts to solve the problem have been to put more sleuths on the unemployment insurance payroll to harass and penalize the odd worker who tries to move through its legal chinks, and to allocate funds to retrain workers—in Ontario some 250 of the estimated 202,000 unemployed—at trades for which there is already no demand.

But two serious propositions that have been advanced to come

See page 3—SHORTER WORK WEEK

Shorter Work-Week the Answer

(Continued from page 1)

to grips with unemployment were discussed at the Ontario Federation of Labor educational seminar this month.

One unionist advanced the idea of nationalization. Wouldn't it be practical to nationalize the mines at Elliot Lake and stock pile the uranium for the production of atomic energy for peaceful use? And why not nationalize AVRO—retooling it for production of goods needed by the Canadian people to sell at cost?

CBRT assistant research director Chigantes attacked nationalization with inanities about "free play in the market" and it being an outmoded instrument. Russell Bell, assistant research director of the CLC, tried to dismiss the proposition with the statement that the trade union movement wouldn't accept nationalization. Fortunately Mr. Bell doesn't apply this method when it comes to political action. Unionists who don't accept it, he attempts to convince of its need. Besides, how does Mr. Bell know that nationalization is unacceptable? Only a few years ago when the CCF brass were dropping nationalization out of the CCF program as being outmoded and unacceptable to the Canadian people a Gallup poll revealed that more Canadians favored nationalization than voted CCF.

The other proposition was the shorter work week, advanced by Steelworkers research director Cleve Kidd. Mr. Kidd was careful to add—at the same take home pay—thereby assuring that it would result in more jobs being available without any loss in the living standard of those now working. Nonetheless the best that the opposition could advance was the false argument of the assistant steelworkers research director that the shorter work week would simply "redistribute the misery."

The delegates were almost unanimous in their support of Mr. Kidd's statement that the shorter work week "must obviously be one of our main objectives." Now the forces to win it must be mobilized.

Is Referendum a Good Demand?

Some of our readers have expressed reservations about a demand that the **Vanguard** has campaigned for in the past and that has been raised on a broader and more popular plane at the Vancouver BC Radiations Hazards meeting.

We refer to the demand that the decision on the arming of Canadian forces with nuclear devices, both here and abroad, should not be left to the Diefenbaker cabinet and their handraisers in the commons, but should be made by the people themselves in a national referendum.

Those who have questioned the advisability of the **Vanguard** promoting and now continuing to identify itself with this slogan are of course opposed to nuclear arms on Canadian soil. They share our opposition to the entire drive towards the militarization of the world and are for disarmament, starting first where they themselves are a factor, in Canada. They are for unilateral disarmament.

They fear if there were such a referendum, that the people of Canada have been so deceived, that they would vote not against nuclear armament, but for it. They fear that the psychological preparation of the Canadian people has gone so far apace that the capitalists, with their open and hidden persuaders, would be able to assure a vote favoring nuclear armament.

They fear that the plebiscite, the referendum, used so effectively by Hitler and recently by de Gaulle, is a useful tool for governments, with the mass media at their disposal, to overwhelm their opposition and get the answer they desire. With good cause they question the democratic process as it operates in the dollar democracies.

We think that they misread the whole Canadian scene as it is today. In our opinion the evidence is overwhelming that the Canadian people are opposed to the nuclear armament of Canadian forces. How else can one explain the long and devious procrastinations of the Diefenbaker government? How else explain that the Liberals, who, when in office, got the process underway, are now opposing nuclear arms in Canada?

If the government were to set a date for a popular vote on nuclear arms a great debate across the nation would open up. To be sure the warmongers would have a field day—but aren't they having one now? And the opposition, wouldn't it get a much larger hearing than it is now?

Even the capitalist press, radio and TV, in order not to discredit itself completely and thereby end its usefulness, would have to open up to the opponents of nuclear arms.

Hundreds of thousands, many the bitterest opponents of the present set-up, who in despair no longer participate in the usual channels of democratic expression, would be stirred to listen and to act, if only due to the example, the pressure of the rest of the population.

What have we got to lose? Without the referendum and the debate that would go with it, without a formal mandate from the people, the Diefenbaker government has been steadily moving along the way to the commitment of the country to nuclear armament. Should the worst fears materialize and the people, after the great debate, vote for nuclear arms, we opponents will continue to hold our position of opposition—as we do today—as a minority—and certainly a more powerful one than now. So what have we got to lose? We have much to gain.

vanguard

Mid-March, 1961 Vol. 6, No. 2(62) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

PAGE 1 of 2

DEMOCRACY KEY TO BUILDING NEW PARTY

Time is slipping past. It is only five months now from the founding of the new labor party. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians from all walks of life have to be talked to, informed of the general aims of the party, their doubts overcome, and as many as possible convinced of the necessity to join the new party.

But what are the top echelons of the Ontario CCF and trade union movement preoccupied with? Certainly not with creating the most favorable atmosphere to build the party. They are busy restricting the membership of the party, creating an atmosphere of fear and suspicion—with keeping certain persons out of the party.

There were few motions of any kind before the annual Toronto and District CCF convention this month—practically none on policy and nothing on how to swing things into motion—but there was one on organization barring admission to Communists—and Trotskyists! The front page of the Jan.-Feb. Ontario Federation of Labor PAC Memo was taken up with an outline of the third step in building the basic organizational machinery for the new party—committees for the new party—at the local level. Instead of outlining ideas as to how to make these committees more dynamic, more effective party builders—it establishes as a key point, who can't be on them. This time bars are raised not only on members of Communist and Trotskyist groups, but against persons "'associated with" such groups or "any of their front organizations."

The some 300 CCF and new party activists who attended this month's rally called by the Metro Toronto New Party Committee were warned by chairman Sefton about the efforts of the Trotskyists in and around the new party to "win friends and influence people."

What do the top CCF and trade union brass hope to gain? Are they suggesting that the class struggle socialists both in and out of the CCF and who support the new party 100 per cent, and thus have every right to participate with at least all the privileges being so freely granted to erstwhile Liberal and Tory supporters; that the Communists, who don't support the new party anyway, are some kind of a threat to the democratic fabric of the new party? Are they preparing to take actions in its "defence" by cutting democracy out of the new party?

What an auspicious beginning this is—that they should stir up the old squabbles, the old hatreds, slanders, and commence to clamp down the restrictions that crippled the CCF, to foul up the atmosphere around the new party before it is even launched!

Do they really think that by they themselves red baiting, by protesting their purity from all radical intent, that they can forestall the capitalist politicians and their venal hangers-on from red baiting the new party? Vain hope! When they smell fear, the witch hunters only become bolder.

Let's make the new party really new—genuinely democratic, encompassing all those who identify themselves with its purpose, where all views are heard. Then the Canadian working class, knowing that in the clash of ideas the truth will be arrived at and will prevail in its ranks, can face the future with confidence.

TO page 2

WORKERS' VANGUARD - Mid-March 1961 #62 - Page 2 Editorials

THE W RD

Published monthly by The Workers' Vanguard Publishing Assoc.
81 Queen Street West, Toronto 1, Ont. — EM. 6-1454
EDITOR—ROSS DOWSON Subscriptions 50c a year (12 issues)

The policy of The Workers Vanguard is reflected in its editorials. Signed articles and features express the ideas of our contributors and do not necessarily represent the policies or opinion of The Workers' Vanguard.

Set up and printed by Merchants Press, 323 King St. W., Toronto
Authorized as Second Class matter, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Mid-Mar 61

Make Mahoney Eat His Words

Elroy Robson, vice-president of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers (CLC) could not suppress his cry—"shame." In the next month new party activists amongst the 110,000 non-operating employees of the 15 railway unions will be adding their protests against William Mahoney's statements at Niagara Falls CLC seminar on labor's public responsibility in collective bargaining. And so should all CCF and NP activists across the country.

Mahoney is not only the Canadian director of the United Steelworkers of America, Canada's biggest union, but he is a member of the new party national committee.

Judging from Mahoney's words the new party in office will conduct itself little different from the way the Tory Diefenbaker government did when it froze the railway workers' wages and deprived them of labor's traditional right to strike.

"When we come to power," he said, "let's not think that it's all going to be peaches and cream. We may have to face the problem as it comes about. If I had the responsibility of government I would have attempted to impose some sort of settlement that might not have pleased management or labor. But I am glad I'm not in that position."

Let's make Mahoney sad that he made this statement, and the new party national committee happy to repudiate it, rather than unionists convinced that there is nothing new in the new party after all.

Light on Korea and Boss Press

Why did the armed forces of People's China cross the Yalu into Korea early in the winter of 1950? To plan the North Korean attack on South Korea and promote revolutions across Asia? That's what all the daily press said. That was the argument behind Prime Minister St. Laurent's mobilization of Canadian armed forces for Korean action, and the reasoning behind CCF leader Coldwell's urgent demand that Canada place itself fully behind US intervention, later underwritten by the United Nations.

Now, 11 years later, the truth is told by a journalist on an assignment for the US air force which commissioned the Rand Corporation to examine this question—an Allen Whiting, who has presented his findings in the book **China Crosses the Yalu.** Now they are telling some of the truth about this war that flattened almost the entire Korean peninsula, wiped out its peoples, and took the lives and mangled the flesh of thousands who went into Korea under the UN's blue banner.

The Chinese crossed the Yalu for the simple reason that they assumed that the UN forces under the command of General MacArthur, having conquered Korea, planned to invade China. That is Whiting's conclusion. But according to Whiting, while this assumption was natural, it was falacious, and due entirely to a breakdown in communications—"inadequate communication . . . played a pivotal role in precipitating the war . . ."

Western news media reflected MacArthur's view that such an expedition was necessary—and here was the big mistake, according to Whiting—this was not at all the view of the US government!

This will come as news to General MacArthur for just a few months ago in a hassle with former President Truman, in the course of which he affirmed that Truman needlessly ordered the horror bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, he charged that Washington's proclamation of the bridges across the Yalu, and Chinese supply bases as "a privileged sanctuary," was "unprecedented and astonishing."

Of course the press did play a big role. But it wasn't the Chinese who were deceived! They read it right! It was the people of America and the rest of the world who were deceived and who paid for this war which almost flung the planet into the atomic holocaust.

Korean war correspondent William Stevens, until recently Toronto **Globe and Mail** New Delhi correspondent, in a review of the book, makes some pertinent observations on the press. "This book unintentionally puts the press of the so-called free world in a bad light for it tells what many war correspondents in Korea suspected but what few of us could write." Why couldn't they write the truth, even had they wanted? "Because there was scarcely a newspaper outside the US that would support the kind of investigation conducted in this book by Allen S. Whiting," says Stevenson.

Stevenson reveals why the daily press covered the Korean war as it did—because it is a kept press—an instrument of government policy—it is a capitalist press! "The news sources were almost exclusively US military organs," he writes. "Even the CBC covered Korea most of the time from Tokyo and the costly expense of daily radio circuits to Canada were borne by the US government."

Which only shows that anyone failing to make a class analysis of all important social questions, anyone who doesn't see as underlying all the main phenomena in society, the class struggle, the conflict between labor and capital, is in constant danger of being a dupe and a fool. And even worse, should he assume the obligation of telling others—an apologist and a stooge for the capitalist class.

Workers' Vanguard Mid-March 1961 # 62

Letters to the Editor

HITS B.C. LEADERS

Mid-Mar '61

Editor:

Enclosed you will find a clipping of a so-called urgent message published in the latest issue of *CCF News*, the BC CCF newspaper.

The various clubs decided that it is of the utmost importance to hold a provincial convention prior to the founding convention of the new party. We feel it is necessary to formulate a concrete stand and platform before, not after, the founding convention. After the convention we will be able to take no direct action to formulate this policy.

It is quite evident that they, the party brass, do not want us, the rank and file members, to form any opposition, or any form of collective action.

I believe that to use the *CCF News* for this type of bourgeois activity is an infringment on our democratic rights. The *CCF News* was designed to bring the truth to our membership. It was not designed to intimidate our delegates on the provincial council into voting the way the provincial executive decides or demands.

In closing I would like to say that as a conscious socialist I must object to this type of bureaucratic control of the workers' press—it must cease immediately.

A. L. EVANS,
Burnaby 3, B.C.

In our last issue we reported that, on the motion of Colin Cameron and May Campbell, the provincial council of the BC CCF, defeating the executive, approved the calling of a convention of the BC section prior to the founding New Party convention. Now the provincial executive, over the name of President Jones, has refused to accept this decision and in the clipping from our correspondent has announced that it is calling another provincial council meeting in the hope of blocking a convention. Naturally enough the executive says nothing about their fears that the convention would take a firm stand against NATO and prove a rallying point for a serious fight to win the new party to a socialist policy. They call for reconsideration of the decision on the allegation that various constituencies are urging reconsideration, that there is no time for proper preparations, a shortage of funds, and that the vote at the previous council meeting (26 to 23) was not recounted upon request. — Editor.

AN OPEN LETTER TO MR DIEFI

—By the Editors—

The Ha
Vanqu

May, 1961 #63 Vol. 6, No. 3(63)

When you campaigned as the head of the Progressive Conservative Party you presented yourself as a vigorous defender of Canadian sovereignty and an inveterate opponent of any infringments of that sovereignty by the rulers of the United States. Some political commentators even went so far as to attribute your election victory to your declaration of Canadian independence of the U.S.

When you assumed the office of Prime Minister you cloaked yourself in what you and your kind present as the very symbol of the power, the sacred right, the authority of the Canadian people to govern this country as they see fit, to pass laws, rules and regulations through which they could shape the character of the economy, and determine their role in international affairs, and so forth.

Why then, have you remained silent on U.S. President Kennedy's statement to American newspaper editors in which he said: "if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I wantit clearly understood that this government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our own nation."

This is an unmistakeably clear declaration that the ruling class of the U.S. consider it their inalienable right to intervene in Canadian affairs at any time that they decide it serves their purpose.

Do not say that you are unaware that this interpretation has been placed on the Kennedy statement! Your External Affairs Minister Howard Green was quick to assure the house that President Kennedy was not referring to Canada in his speech, but to Cuba and other South American states where apparently he thinks it to be alright.

But as if to remove any doubt from anyone's mind as to President Kennedy's meaning, one of his top advisors, Adolfe A. Berle, spelled it out at a subsequent meeting in Washington. "The U.S. president made it clear that the United States would meet its primary objectives of national and hemisphere defence against outside penetration. By implication," Berle said, "he made clear that foreign intervention does not cease to be intervention because it flies a non-Russian flag and claims to be a social revolution."

There you have it, so that a two year old could grasp. No matter what the Canadian people might call it—public ownership of US pipeline interests, or what you will—the US bosses will call it communist penetration—and that's out, and will be ruled out by whatever means are necessary, possibly even US troops, if thought necessary.

It is bad enough that you have issued no word of protest against this arrogant and tyrannous challenge to Canadian national sovereignty, but even worse that without so much as a by-your-leave from the Canadian people, you have taken it upon yourself to underwrite it as applied by Kennedy to Cuba and other Latin American states. And worse still, have declared, in our name, that Canada itself practices the same arrogant imperialistic policy toward Cuba.

You made the Kennedy doctrine your doctrine in your statement that Cuba is a casualty of the internationalization of its original revolution, that "the interests of the Cuban people have been subordinated to the interplay of outside forces beyond their control." In your statement that while Canada "has neither the means nor the intention to intervene"—it could not be indifferent "to this new danger which affects the hemisphere in which we live."

It is no thanks to you that Canada did not have the means to intervene, to participate in President Kennedy's imperialist assault on Cuba, that the extent of "the very

to page 2

WV #63 May 1961 Editorials page 2

TH
Published m
81 Queen Street W
EDITOR—ROSS DOWSON Subscript a year (12 issues)

UARD
Publishing Assoc.
EM. 6-1454

The policy of The Workers Vanguard is reflected in its editorials. Signed articles and features express the ideas of our contributors and do not necessarily represent the policies or opinion of The Workers' Vanguard.

Set up and printed by Merchants Press, 323 King St. W., Toronto
Authorized as Second Class matter, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Open Letter to Prime Minister

(Continued from page 1)

limit of our ability," which Liberal leader Pearson urged be granted to the US adventure, was words.

But thank you for these words, Mr. Prime Minister. Henceforth whenever you andyour government's spokesmen talk in our name in the chancellories and forums of the world about Canada as a sovereing nation, with a record that proves its ability to be an impartial arbitrator and mediator in international conflicts, the world's people will know that this is a fraud and deception.

And whenever you orate about democracy and freedom, about the supremacy of parliament, and the supreme authority of the Canadian people, fulminate against alien influences in Canadian life, about disloyalty and even subversion, many more than before will know that it is as the sound of brass.

Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister! You have shown what peril lies ahead should we not break Canada from the international commitments that you have made in our name — and the dire need for Canada to withdraw from both NORAD and the NATO military alliance.

Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister! You have made it clearer that the Canadian people must take the power from you and your parliament's hands to decide the issues of war and peace, that we must increase our efforts to win a popular referendum on the question of the nuclear armament of Canadian military forces.

You have made it clearer that there can be no serious talk about freedom, democracy, Canadian sovereignty, until you representatives of the Big Business interests are driven out of power and we establish a workers and farmers government in Ottawa and in the provinces.

What's in a Name?

Mid Mar '61

Among the matters now being discussed and to be decid d upon at the July-August founding convention in Ottawa is the name with which the new political formation to be launched by the Canadian Labor Congress and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation will appear before the Canadian people.

While program takes top priority this does not mean that the name is a matter of indifference. In politics the name is the banner — a condensed version of the program through which more than anything else the public at large comes to know it and arrives at political alignment.

The political lackeys and servants of Big Business are extremely sensitive to the name, to the face, they present to the electorate. The giant merchandise houses fork out millions to the image makers of Madison Avenue and King Street for trick formula and gimmicks in order to pass off their goods on the public. With greater frequency and on a bigger scale these same image makers are being employed in their electoral campaigns by the Liberals and Tories who have demonstrated considerable flexibility in casting aside worn out or discreditted names and assuming others.Thus we have the BC Conservatives taking over the name Social Credit and the national Party taking on the name "Progressive" Conservative Party. For years now, with the rise of organized labor, the Liberals have been toying with the formula Liberal-Labor—an increasing number are actually contesting elections under this banner.

If these political machines were to truthfully and honestly proclaim their fundamental program in their name, one would immediately disappear, and the fused body, known as the Capitalist party, would shrink to a tiny handful. The parties of capital choose names, change them or modify them with the sole purpose of hiding their true character, to trick and decieve the working people who in ever increasing numbers are coming to see through them and understand their fundamental character.

The committee that has been acting as mid-wife has already apparently set its mind on christening the child of the CLC-CCF—The New Party. Just what does such a name mean today and what will it mean tomorrow to the Canadian people? The arguments advanced in its favor, all the talk about getting free of "doctrinaire approach" and steering clear of "stereo-typed formulae" are on the identical plane as those advanced by the image makers employed by the Liberals, Tories and their capitalist sponsors — a trick, a gimmick, even if one were to cynically concede, played on this occasion, for a noble purpose.

The child of the CLC-CCF should be ushered into the world with a correct label — a label that clearly denotes its real content and suggests a totally different aim from the capitalist parties. That means that of all the names suggested, Labor Party should be chosen. In the clearest and simpliest way this name expresses the social base of the party—organized labor—the force that defends the interests of all those who labor, the most powerful force in society, the greatest bulwark of democracy and the obvious alternative to capital and its political parties.

The Workers
Vanguard

June, 1961 Vol. 6, No. 4 (64) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

FOUND LEAGUE FOR SOCIALIST ACTION

SIC and SEL Unite to Win NP for Socialism

The merging of the forces of the Socialist Information Center of Vancouver and the Socialist Educational League of Toronto into a new national organization, The League for Socialist Action, marks a mighty stride forward in the struggle to win the New Party to a socialist policy and thus establish a socialist society here in Canada.

The road to jobs for all, to prosperity, to peace, is the road to socialism. There is no other. The capitalist system is irreparable, and any program that is based on any illusions on this score or has this in mind is bankrupt and will only lead to the demoralization, disillusionment and open betrayal of those who count on it. Canada, the world, needs a new system geared to the atomic age, to the age of space exploration. The New Party has no perspective without a socialist program. The winning of the new party to such a program is the crying need of the moment. Such is the aim, the purpose, the intention of the League for Socialist Action.

The society of human brotherhood, freedom, peace, that is socialism, is the noblest aim that man has ever aspired to. It has reason and truth on its side. It will eliminate all the pettiness, narrowness, conflict that now saps man's potentialities. All will gain. But the way ahead will not be easy. Athwart it stands vested interest, fear, conservatism. The capitalist opponents of the new party, when not attempting to frontally destroy the new party, are making a big effort to corrupt it and divert it from its purpose. In the new party itself, on the right, is a formidable combination, the self-proclaimed

See page 3—LONG LIVE L.S.A.!

to page 2

WV #64 June 1961 page 2

Editorials

Long Live the L.A.S. !

Continued from page 1

leadership of old time CCFers who have abandoned any socialist ideas that they ever had, and the arrogant trade union brass hats who never did have any concept of seriously fighting for workers demands, let alone a socialist outlook. On the left are the relatively small forces of the newly formed League for Socialist Action, plus many scattered individual socialists and trade union militants.

One might say this is a case of a David against a Goliath. The Goliath-like combination of CCF trade union right wingers appears to have everything in its favour. The power they possess is obvious. It would be foolish to underestimate their influence and their power, or to think that they will not use them against their socialist opponents in the New Party.

However this Goliath-like monster is being undermined by the changing economic and political situation throughout the world, and in Canada in particular. Growing unemployment, the increasing threat of nuclear war and the fierce "cut the costs" attacks of the bosses on the unions, are driving home to an increasing number the utter incapacity and total bankruptcy of the old style leadership that wrecked the CCF and has undermined much of the fighting capacity of organized labor.

This situation means that increasingly large numbers of new party supporters, unionists etc. will be more receptive to and will be looking for, a real alternative policy to that being offered by the self-proclaimed leadership of the New Party.

This does not mean that all that socialists have to do is sit back and wait for these leftward moving people to come to them. It means that those socialists who seriously organize and fight for the correct policies are in a position to make great gains towards the objective of making the New Party really a "new party".

The program drawn up and adopted by the SEL and the SIC, and published in this issue of the **Vanguard,** develops the ideas around which the effort to give the new party a class struggle program and a socialist perspective can take on flesh and blood. The LSA provides the form around which these forces can be gathered, steeled, mobilized.

The editors of the **Vanguard** hail the formation of the League for Socialist Action. We hope that our readers will seriously study its program and join forces with it in perfecting it and promoting it.

There is No Hope Here! June '61

A meeting of the 11-man Security Council of the United Nations may be held sometime this month in reply to a protest of 41 Asian and African states against Portugal's massacre of the natives of Angola. By then the dry season will have started in Angola.

"We've killed 30,000 of these 'animals'. There are probably another 100,000 working with the terrorists. We intend to kill them when the dry season starts . . ." said a Portuguese army officer to a **Daily Mirror** correspondent early in May.

Last March, when the blood letting commenced, a resolution requesting Portugal to grant reforms, and arranging for a UN enquiry, was presented to the Security Council. It failed to get the 7 vote majority needed for approval. A month later it was pushed through the General Assembly and a 5 nation committee set up. It has held only two meetings.

What's behind the stall? Portugal is a member of the NATO alliance. The weapons it is using in its genocidal war are obtained from NATO stockpiles or directly from the U.S. The British government is getting ready to usher Portugal's neighbour, Fascist Spain, into NATO. The US ambassador to Madrid is already on record as saying that the US will support Spanish membership in NATO. MacMillan has just brazenly endorsed his home secretary's remarks that: Spain should be fully integrated into the Western World because with Portugal it constitutes a firm asset for the future greatness of Europe. Portugal is considered such by Britain as witness her recent compliance to a direct request from Salazar to close down a rebel group in British Tanganyika exiled from his colony Mozambique.

The UN's conduct with respect to Angola parallels its performance during the US financed and inspired invasion of Cuba. A mild resolution was backed by representatives of Latin American countries to placate their people who feel strong solidarity with the Cubans, which didn't even name the US and appealed to all states not to allow their territories to be used to promote civil war in Cuba. It failed to get the required 2/3 majority in the Assembly.

Fortunately the Cubans didn't depend on the UN as so tragically did Congolese leader Patrice Lumumba. They depended on their own armed strength.

Workers' Vanguard #64 June 1961

LAUNCH LEFT WING CAUCUS TO WIN THE NEW PARTY TO SOCIALIST POLICY

June '61

BC Socialist Information Center Joins Forces With Toronto League

The CCF members and trade union activists whose efforts maintain the Socialist Information Centre in Vancouver, welcome the opportunity to associate with the Socialist Educational League of Toronto and other groups of people across Canada who fully support the new labor party and who also aspire to consolidate a socialist wing in this development.

Without such a consolidation on a national scale there can be no effective or consistent drive to keep the new party moving towards the left and towards a socialist solution for the problems of this epoch. Without such motion and lacking a socialist perspective the new party will inevitably disillusion its supporters and disintegrate. Prevention of such a catastrophe impels united action by all conscious socialist elements.

Direct participation in politics by the working class organized in trade unions represents such a tremendous step forward and holds such a potential for the final emancipation of all people that nothing should be left undone which would contribute to the maturing of this force.

Past differences, sectarian pride, or vanity — all the barriers which have kept the socialists divided — must be broken down. Open and honest discussion, agreement with a general perspective as a guide to action, facilitates unity in action. We believe the program published in the **Vanguard**, which is the outcome of a great many contributions, will provide the medium for united socialist work in the new party.

The national alliance of forces now being moulded, and with which we are pleased to align ourselves, seems to be a logical outgrowth of our local aspiration.

Here in Vancouver, the Socialist Information Centre came into being when CCF activists and trade unionists recognized the need of providing an arena where conflicting, competing, and parallel views could meet.

The aim of this activity was to develop widening areas of agreement on questions of the day confrontitng the workers. The result being greater unity in action and in the presentation of ideas in the many fields of work covered by the participants.

The new party and its importance to the workers of Canada provided a great objective necessity for the development o the Socialist Information Centre. The extension of this work at the national level, uniting with others who also aspire to bring a socialist content and policy to the new political formation, is both necessary and desirable.

The undersigned, who with many others have articipated and shared in the responsibility of making the Socialist Information Centre possible in Vancouver, take pleasure in associating ourselves with those groups of fellow socialists across Canada who are uniting to help this history-making movement of the Canadian working class make history.

Malcolm Bruce

Ruth Bullock

The League for Socialist Action Essential to Future of New Party

Behind the formation of the Socialist Educational League in Toronto in the fall of 1955 was the crisis and the decline of the CCF. The impulsion behind the fusion of the Socialist Educational League with the Socialist Information Center of Vancouver, and the launching of the League for Socialist Action, is the formation of the new labor party and the opportunities and responsibilities that it presents to socialists.

The formation of the new party is the biggest event in this country in our times. It promises to mobilize the working people of the entire country into anti-capitalist struggle. But such a development is far too precious to be left in the hands of the present leadership of the trade union movement and those whose policies led to their burying the CCF. To realize the possibilities inherent in it, the new party needs a class struggle program and a socialist perspective.

The SEL's founding statement, signed by its now deceased chairman George (Paddy) Stanton, declared that success or failure in its fight against the Liberal-reformist policies that the Coldwell- Lewis leadership were foisting onto the movement would determine whether the CCF would disappear into some new coalition of Liberal-reformist politicians, and all its precious capital as an independent movement of the working people be dissipated, or whether it would serve as an instrument to establish a socialist Canada.

The SEL failed in its aim. The tide of affairs ran too strong against it—it favored the Coldwell's and Lewis' who were able to move from betrayal of the Regina Manifesto, to the expulsion of some 15 from the Ontario section at one blow and the harassment and expulsion of other opponents of their course, to the final burial of the Manifesto and the formal dissolution of the movement.

But in the process of the struggle those who formed the SEL, Socialist-minded CCFers, persons who had been members of the dissolved Revolutionary Workers Party (Trotskyist) and new layers of revolutionary youth, became more solidly organized, developed a clearer concept of their task—and became more prepared to face the opportunities now shaping up before them.

The fusion of the SEL and the SIC brings together forces that have profound and firm ideological agreement and years of experience as fighters for socialist ideas in the CCF, in the trade union movement and the working class generally. The League for Socialist Action, with this base in Vancouver and Toronto, constitutes an important beginning for the building of a national force that can appeal to socialists, trade union militants and new layers of workers and youth who are being attracted to the new party and who know, or will yet become aware, that it must adopt a socialist program.

But as its name implies the League will not rest content with merely advancing ideas. As an integral part of the new labor party it will attempt to mobilize the forces of the new party into action—anti-capitalist, socialist action.

That is what the new party must be—a party that will not only organize the Canadian working class but will give leadership and direction and will win the power. That is what the LSA wants it to do. To realize this aim the League for Socialist Action must be built from coast to coast.

Ross Dowson

Page 1/2 Workers Vanguard #64 June 1961

The Need for the LSA & What it Wants

For Peace Policy
Public Ownership

June '61

The League for Socialist Action is a fusion of the Socialist Educational League, centered in Toronto, and the Socialist Information Center of Vancouver, and their supporters scattered across Canada.

The League for Socialist Action is committed to unconditional support of the new party in its objective to place workers' and farmers' governments in Ottawa and the provinces.

Its purpose is (1) to bring together, to organize into an effective force, all supporters of the new party who seek to win it to a class struggle program and a socialist objective; (2) to build the party, to participate in its day to day activities and to advance ideas that will give conscious direction to the working people of Canada in their struggles to defend and extend their interests.

The first requirement for the workers in all countries of the world is to break cleanly from the capitalist class and their political parties, and any and all concepts of coalitions with their parties. The workers and farmers must build a party of their own based on their primary class organizations, the trade unions, with the aim of taking the power out of the hands of the capitalist class and into their own hands.

The new party being organized by the CCF and the CLC meets this requirement. It opens up the possibility of galvanizing the entire working people of Canada, in alliance with the struggles of the workers in other parts of the globe, to eliminate once and for all the recurring depressions spawned by capitalism and to eliminate its wars which now threaten mankind with atomic destruction, and to usher in a new world of peace and plenty.

Those associated together in the League for Socialist Action seek to join forces with all those who now understand this challenge in order to win the majority of the working class to this realization. Our support for the new party is unconditional. Our participation is not contingent upon certain specific programmatic planks being adopted by the new party, and we lay down no terms as to who must be in the leadership of the new party. We recognize the authority of the majority in democratic debate to decide the policy of the party and to elect the leadership it sees fit to pledge to implement that policy.

At the same time we affirm the right of the minority to freely advance its ideas in the organizations that are part of and allied to the new party, and to seek to win the majority to the support of its views and establish a leadership in the party consonant with its views.

While we declare our unconditional support for the new party we declare our conviction, based on experiences both in Canada and in other parts of the world, and on our analysis of objective reality, that the program being advanced by the leadership of the CLC and the CCF is inadequate. Were it to become and to remain the program of the party it would render it incapable of meeting the needs of those whose support it seeks.

Prominent figures in drawing together the forces for the organization of the League for Socialist Action are (upper left) Ruth Bullock, well known activist in CCF and union circles in the Vancouver area, (upper right) Ross Dowson, of Toronto, editor of Workers Vanguard, and (lower left) Malcolm Bruce, nationally known revolutionary socialist, journalist, a familiar figure on the CCF and labor platform in Vancouver.

Their program is reformist when the task is revolulutionary — that is, socialist. While capitalism is moving out to slash the many gains already won, imposing new burdensome taxes, straight-jacketing organized labor with union-busting laws, cutting down on social legislation, and throwing hundreds of thousands into unemployment; they talk in terms of the affluent society and the amelioration of class conflicts. They project a perspective of merely removing what they present as minor defects in the existing capitalist order of things, of patching capitalism up and making it more tolerable, instead of a perspective of fundamental change. While the movement is clearly working class, the present leadership preaches conciliation, peaceful co-existence with capitalism, not class struggle against it.

This is the most revolutionary period in human history. One third of the world's population lives under a planned economy — which is the foundation for their colossal progress and achievements of the past decade. With increasing strength the peoples of East Germany, Poland, Hungary and in the Soviet Union itself, are striving against the bureaucratic regime to establish working class democracy. Whole continents are being torn by revolutionary struggle from the domination and exploitation of the imperialists. Cuba, just 90 miles off the American coast, with its example and inspiration, is stirring all Latin America.

Within a generation we have suffered two world wars of unprecedented slaughter and destruction and have been afflicted with the waste and demoralization of cataclysmic economic crises. With the loss of their imperialist holdings and the entry of new forces onto the world market the capitalists attempt to keep their industrial plants operating and profits pouring in by initiating a vast program of military expenditures. To no avail — a major crisis is shaping up in the capitalist world. In desperation they are attempting to shore up the system by turning against the workers at home. Capitalism promises the people of Canada not amelioration of conditions but austerity, oppression, dictatorship and/or atomic destruction of mankind. Only through an irreconcilable struggle against capitalism, towards its elimination and the establishment of socialism, will the Canadian people and the people of the world find the full freedom, equality and democracy for which they aspire.

The threat to the peace of the world, the main force behind the drive towards atomic destruction is not the Soviet Union — nor is it China. It is American imperialism and the old but now much enfeebled imperialists, and their hangers-on such as Canada, which seek to roll back the struggles of the colonial peoples and re-establish their domination of those areas from which they have been driven.

It was the U.S. that flew the U2 planes, that conducts provocative nuclear armed airflights over Canadian territory right up to the borders of the Soviet Union, that thousands of miles from American shores has built more than 300 military bases that are encircling and directed at the Soviet areas. It was the U.S. which stalled on the cessation of atomic tests and procrastinates in the disarmament sessions, while, along with its satellites, increasing military expenditures and perfecting ever-more fiendish instruments of death and destruction.

To be a factor for peace Canada must be broken from the commitments made by the Liberals and the Tories to the imperialist war drive and must be identified with the freedom struggles everywhere. The new party forces must mobilize the Canadian people in the struggle against war, must raise the demand: that the question of nuclear

See overleaf TO PAGE 2

The Need for the LSA & What it Wants

Continued from overleaf

arms in Canada be taken out of the hands of the government and decided by the people in a national referendum.

The new party should commit itself to struggle now, and when elected break Canada from participation in the NATO military alliance, withdraw Canada from NORAD, remove all Canadian forces from the soil of any other country and demand the withdrawal of other country's armed forces from Canadian soil. For the reallocation of all military appropriations to the financing of vast programs of low cost, low rental subsidized housing, schools, hospitals and roads. No shipment of Canadian uranium to any country manufacturing and testing H Bombs — for the stockpiling of uranium and a crash program to develop its use for the production of energy for peaceful purposes.

No support of the U.N. which has proved to be an instrument of imperialist strategy, but rather towards an alliance, a free association of the people of the world by the identification of Canada with the world-wide anti-imperialist and socialist strivings through a program of trade and aid. For recognition of China, for extended credits to Cuba and all countries seeking trade and aid. Only when the working people of Canada and the major countries in the world have the power in their own hands can we realize the cherished commonwealth of labor.

The new party must mobilize the people of Canada behind a program which will block and reverse all the efforts of the Canadian capitalist class and their political lackeys, the Liberal, Progressive Conservative and Social Credit parties, to impose the crisis of their system on the backs of the working people.

Technological progress is now reaping vast profits for the industrial and financial oligarchy and condemning thousands to permanent unemployment. The new party must solidarize itself with organized labor's fight to win the benefits of technological change for the workers by establishing the shorter work-week with the same take-home-pay in all union contracts, and by fighting to enact a shorter legal work-week. The establishment of a sliding scale of hours would insure that all have the right to work.

Alleviate the hardship of unemployment with; unemployment insurance for the duration of unemployment at union rates of pay; for union organization of the unemployed, linking up the unemployed with the fighting capacity of organized labor.

Mobilize popular opposition to roll back the anti-labor offensive, wipe all union-busting legislation off the books, encourage, promote, strengthen all organizations of the working people, the co-ops, the credit unions, trade unions — for a Bill of Rights.

Public ownership, nationalization of the basic industries and the financial institutions, the establishment of industrial democracy, participation of the people in the service of the people, is not some abstract principle or the expression of an ultimate objective. The crucial dependence of Canadian economy on the world market and its uneven development has transformed public ownership and production for use from a programmatic statement on the nature of the socialist society that lies ahead and a desirable aim, into an immediate necessity.

To the Nova Scotia CCF-NP demand that the coal industry there be nationalized, should be added; the nationalization of the government-financed Malton AVRO plant, its re-tooling and the production of goods needed by the people for sale at cost. The nationalization of the government-financed uranium industry and a crash program to develop uranium for peaceful energy purposes. The nationalization of the CPR and its unification with the CNR, their re-financing and their co-ordination to provide a nation-wide network functioning in the interests of those working it and providing transportation at cost.

Open the books of big business so that the truth about prices, wages, cost of production, distribution and profits, executive salaries, kickbacks and payola, so that the waste and inefficiency, so that the source of the crisis of the economy is laid bare. Take over the idle factories, the electrical goods plants, the textile mills, that are turning once prosperous communities into ghost towns, produce for use under the control of the workers through a national plan.

The League for Socialist Action identifies itself fully with all such demands as; a non-contributory national health plan, free university tuition, the 18-year-old vote, parity prices for farmers, cheap loans and low cost credit to owner-operated businesses and working farmers. The League for Socialist Action identifies itself with all the social conquests of the working people and with all proposals that would deepen and extend them. It solidarizes itself with all actions which heighten the consciousness of the Canadian working class of the real situation confronting them; it supports any action which further cements their unity against capitalism and which would strengthen their capacity to struggle and project them towards the achievement of a workers' and farmers' government.

The new party opens up tremendous possibilities before the Canadian people. But to realize these possibilities it must present itself as a real alternative to the capitalist parties It must be rooted in the working class — in the primary organization of the working class, the trade unions. The working class is the only class in modern capitalist society in profound and persistent conflict with the tiny handful of financial and industrial tycoons who control the economy and state apparatus. The unions are the only mass organized social movement in conflict on productive processes and the planning of the economy for a day-to-day basis with capitalism at the key point of their power — their control of the productive machinery of the nation.

The new party must be an integral part of the lives of the workers, inextricably tied to their day-to-day struggles and not a mere election machine, persistently seeking funds but limiting the political activity of the workers to electioneering, going to the ballot box periodically then handing the job over to specialists, to MP's and MLA's. Labor political action is not a substitute for on-the-job action but a broad generalization and heightening of the day-to-day struggle, on the job, on the picket line, organizing, propagandizing, agitating, on all levels of the population and in all fields, cultural, social and on the municipal, provincial and federal areas of government, co-ordinating, giving leadership and direction to the Canadian working people.

The new party must develop its leaders and spokesmen from its own ranks. While welcoming intellectuals and professional people it will put into positions of trust an responsibility only those who identify themselves completely with the workers' cause. Such persons, by their loyalty, their commitment to the aims of the party ranks, by their militancy and example, will help to overcome the deep underlying cynicism that has dissaffected large layers of the population from political life and will inspi them to join in the struggle.

The movement must be democratic — open to all who commit themselves to its support. It must have in internal life which not only permits, but consciously encourages the full play and exchange of ideas. Only then is there any assurance that the party will adopt the correct policies — only then can it develop and choose the type of leadership that the struggle for a socialist Canada in a socialist world requires.

The new party is here. The socialists greet this development with deep satisfaction and enthusiasm. We are confident that the experiences ahead will prove the validity of our ideas which have been forged in the struggles of the past and will be re-tempered in the struggles ahead.

The attempts of the CCF-CLC leadership, expressed in the loose formulations adopted at the Winnipeg CLC convention, to launch some kind of liberal-labor coalition, were dashed to pieces by the onrush of events, by the developing economic crisis and the Tory-Liberal S.C. anti-labor drives. Regardless of any desires to the contrary the new party enters the arena as a class party, a labor party.

Despite the campaign of lies and distortions about the socialist viewpoint we are confident that developing realities, together with the conscious participation of all who consider themselves socialists, around such a program as we have outlined, will make the new party a powerful leap forward on the march to a socialist Canada.

Page 2 WW #64 June 1961

June, 1961 Vol. 6, No. 4 (64) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

STRIKE TORONTO HOUSING TO GAIN DECENT CONDITIONS

By P. Kent

"You've been hollering for action, now you'll get it", declared Charles Irvine, international president of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons union, to a stormy meeting of 3,500 Toronto building trades workers. "Nobody goes back to work until everything is unionized from the ground to the roof", he shouted.

Within the week about 10,000 construction workers, largely Italian immigrants, through an inspiring display of militancy, imposed a complete shutdown on house and apartment construction, some 150 million dollars worth, in the Metropolitan area.

Supported by 19 unions in the Toronto Building Trades Council, which are tied up in conciliation with the Builders Exchange, the struggle could easily boil over to close down all construction, including commercial building.

Last year, sparked by the Hogg's Hollow Tunnel fire and cave-in which resulted in the death of five, through criminal negligence of the bosses, some five categories of building trade workers outside of the traditional unions, organized, struck, and won some 600 contracts. But as the contractors themselves admit they have not adhered to the contracts.

After referring to the problem of weather, the president of the Toronto Metropolitan Home Builders Association frankly stated that "to operate efficiently the sub contractor must be free to hire and direct his men . . . . without interference by unions". The president of the Carpentry Contractors Association, while using the phoney argument that the walkout is illegal, admitted that contractors had refused to honour the wage provisions. "The competition was so fierce from non union contractors that we just couldn't exist", he pled. But according to Gerry Gallagher of the Hod Carriers, the construction bosses have amassed a half million dollar fund to fight the most exploited workers in the Toronto area.

Irvine testifies that members of one of the Brandon Hall locals had been short changed out of $80,000 in wages and only $39,000 had been recovered through court action. Violations of contracts had been so numerous, he says, that the unions would be in

See page 4—FOR SHOWDOWN

Shut Down Toronto House Construction

From page 1

the courts for 15 years if they sought redress through that channel. Hundreds have been chisseled out of vacation pay, laborers forced to work at 90 cents an hour and less, bricklayers as much as a dollar an hour less than the scale. Many have had to wait weeks for their wages, some being forced to resort to the courts and even losing them through contractors declaring bankruptcy.

This year the Brandon Hall group is intent on enforcing the contracts and strengthening their position by organizing the unorganized. Flying squads, striking deep outside the Metro area have shut down everything, but not without a terrific battle with contractors who are employing every trick in the book.

The police have moved in brutally, concentrating on arresting the bi-lingual picket captains, arresting and holding many over night, without charge and without friends or families being notified. Scarboro police have been removed from beats to gang up on construction sites, with the inspector threatening to declare large congregations of strikers unlawful assemblies.

Contractors have been circulating pamphlets outlining the Ontario Labor Relations Act and the Immigration Act—portions in the latter dealing with deportation are emphasized in large type. In a bold bid to terrorize the strikers and their families, which received widespread publicity in the daily press, the president of the Metropolitan Home Builders Association demanded that the federal citizenship and immigration minister deport strikers convicted in the courts.

But the strikers are moving from strength to strength. The support expressed by the 19 locals in the Building Trades Council and the Teamsters has caused the employers to show some caution. Three drivers of ready mix cement trucks, fired for refusal to cross a picket, as their last year contract permits, were quickly re-instated; no doubt in fear of repercussions through the Building Trades Council affiliates.

In answer to the inability of the union to enforce the contracts wrung out of some 600 employers after last year's militant battle, Irvine has suggested to the Department of Labor that it adopt a new method of arbitrating claims of contract violation.

Department officials declined. Co-leader of the drive, Bruno Zanini, has suggested the licensing of contractors and builders and the revocation of the licenses if contract obligations are not met.

But the solution lies in the union movement itself, in the cutting away of the barriers that the building craft unions have erected against the wave of immigrants entering the building trade. No doubt this would be upsetting for the leadership of these unions which have many of the characteristics of job trusts, guaranteeing work and good wages for a restricted, select few. The unbridled exploitation of immigrant labor has threatened the strategic position of these unions and forced the leadership to express sympathy and support to the Brandon Hall group. The fusion of the five trades in the Brandon Hall group with their respective Building Trades Council union is the only long range defence of the hours and conditions that the latter have established and it is the best way to enforce the contracts that the determination and militancy of this strike promises to win.

Workers' Vanguard #64 June 1961

MAKE NP FORCE FOR PEACE BREAK CANADA FROM NATO

June/61

By Ross Dowson

With the precedent-making declaration that NATO is nothing but a military alliance and that Canada should withdraw from it, the 1960, the last CCF national convention made it possible to anticipate that the new labor party can be launched at its founding convention as a conscious and mighty factor for peace.

It is the question of NATO that demarks those who have a serious attitude to the fight against war from those who can be charitably said to be opposed to war but whose confusion and unwillingness to confront reality threatens to prevent the new party from being a serious force in the fight to stop World War III.

British Labor Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell, who is the mentor of the reformist wing in the new party's forces, summed up the issues at debate this way: "The issue between these people (those who want Britain to have no nuclear arms) and the rest of us is not anything like as fundamental as our differences with those who want us to get out of NATO altogether. I regard the issue of whether we have nuclear weapons under our control—providing that we remain in NATO —or whether we do not, is largely a matter of balance between economic, military and political factors."

The issue today that divides the anti-war forces from those whose policies strengthen the war drive is, as it was eleven years ago, NATO.

Canada's membership or non-membership in NORAD is not a serious matter of debate. There is no prominent representative of the new party forces, nor for that matter of the capitalist Liberal Party, who favors Canadian forces being supplied with nuclear weapons. Though the Diefenbaker government is still involved in NORAD and has made all the preparations for the nuclear armament of Canadian forces, whether Canada remains in NORAD and whether its forces are armed with nuclear equipment is no longer of vital importance. As Gaitskell would put it, the balance between economic, military and political factors no longer requires the political spokesmen of Canadian capitalism to make it one.

With the development of the inter continental ballistic missile NORAD has no military function whatsoever. As a symbol of Canadian commitment to the U.S. it has become a liability. It compromises Canada's usefulness in the world political arena. With the Polaris and U.S. overkill capacity in H bombs, what purpose is there in pressing Canada to have a few H bombs? Besides there are forces in U.S. political life which render it difficult for Kennedy to make delivery.

Whether Canada has nuclear devices is not so important as long as Canada remains part of the NATO alliance—a military system the corner stone of which is the U.S. H bomb.

It was the realization of this that swung the majority of the delegates at the last CCF convention to pass, despite the opposition of almost the entire leadership, the motion that Canada withdraw from NATO. For the past several months considerable energy has been expended to assure that this is undone and that the new party underwrites Diefenbaker's policy of Canadian membership in NATO. One of the more important contributions is Canadian Labor Congress secretary treasurer Donald MacDonald's interview with John Brewin, syndicated throughout the CCF and trade union press.

MacDonald attempts to present NATO as some form of international democratic parliament of nations which the Canadian people can contribute to and seriously influence for the cause of peace and international good will.

It is not an accident that he makes no mention of the composition of the NATO alliance—the fact that Adenauer, De Gaulle Salazar are in its ranks, and Chiang Kai-Shek, and until recently Singman Rhee, are allies in parallel pacts. It is all too obvious that such allies are not bound together by love of peace, political liberty or personal freedom. The former are clearly the bulwarks of capitalism in Europe, the latter allies of American imperialism in Asia.

NATO proved to be no restraint on Britain or France in their combined assault on the Suez. It had no influence on France in Algeria or on Belgium's conduct in the Congo. It is not checking Portugal in Angola and it would appear that the NATO allies were totally ignorant of the U.S.'s intentions to launch the recent invasion of Cuba.

Far from blocking these atrocities and acts of brinkmanship, NATO weapon stores made some of them possible, as in the case of France in Algeria and today, Portugal in Angola.

NATO has not in any way expedited disarmament as MacDonald would have us believe. Quite the contrary, it is a pact for more efficient armament. De Gaulle has made France a nuclear power on his own. At Ottawa President Kennedy committed the U.S. to providing NATO with nuclear weapons under the alliance's control. Among these would be five — with more to come — polaris atomic missiles. And he added, "beyond this we look to the possibility of eventually establishing a NATO seaborne missile force . . ."

MacDonald is for nuclear disarmament for Canada—but not for NATO. He is for nuclear arms but on a more rational basis, leaving it "up to those who are able to do it."

If, however, you are skeptical of his warning that "if we pull out we will lose our place in the disarmament negotiations and any influence we now have on the western nuclear powers" he has another trick up his sleeve. Such a policy of Canadian withdrawal from NATO, if acted upon, would lead to annihilation, he claims. It would "weaken one side of this power balance "and would tempt the other to go for an easy victory," he cries.

Finally he pulls out the carrot of economic aid to the underdeveloped countries through NATO. This was the bait which Coldwell used 11 years ago with the help of David Lewis, who pioneered the line of infiltrating NATO to influence policy, in order to overcome rank and file opposition to Canada's original decision to join NATO. No matter that NATO has given no economic aid whatsoever to the underdeveloped countries, but only machine gun fire and napalm bombs, MacDonald holds out the promise again.

New Party leader aspirant T. C. DOUGLAS seeks to swing the party founding convention behind the NATO war pact.

Eleven years ago the BC provincial council refused to endorse CCF support of NATO. The BC convention opposed the national leadership's policy. The Saskatchewan convention took a neutral stand and the Ontario youth provincial council rejected NATO.

They saw the clauses about establishing freedom of the airways, which Eisenhower later utilized to justify U2 penetration of Soviet air space. They saw an earlier version of the Kennedy doctrine, the clause declaring the right of NATO to intervene against revolutions, and the clause on the arms unification plans. They saw NATO as an extension of the Marshall Plan which split Europe into two armed camps and about which U.S. Secretary of Defence Forrestal said: "I am certain that General Marshall had in mind to ask European nations to grant military bases for American forces in return for economic aid."

Those who opposed Canada becoming part of the NATO alliance have proven correct. The events of eleven years have vindicated their position. Now the record can be straightened out by the new party convention taking a clear and forthright stand that Canada should withdraw from the NATO alliance.

The Workers
Vanguard

Mid-July 1961 Vol. 6, No. 5 (65) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

New Labor Party Great Leap

By ROSS DOWSON

The only real strength that the working people possess is their great numbers and their unity While they produce all the wealth of the country they have no real control over any aspect of their lives. This lies firmly in the hands of a tiny handful of Canadian capitalists who, in collusion with foreign capitalists, own and manipulate the vast resources of the nation, the government and all its appendages, to serve their interests.

The chief strength of capitalism is the disunity of those who do the work, the conflicts, the antagonisms that it consciously promotes amongst those upon whom it battens.

With the founding of the new party and it becoming a mighty force all this can be transformed and Canada can become a truly united nation, united against poverty, and exploitation, against the common enemy — capitalism — both at home and abroad.

The Canadian Labor Congress encompasses almost 1¼ million workers in its ranks but there are hundreds of thousands of organized workers who are not part of it. Through the new party this costly division can be overcome. The new party can mobilize the youth, the thousands of pensioners, the working farmer, in united struggle for a commonwealth of labor.

This is the promise of the new party. But already there is talk about "split", about a "brawl" between the socialists and the reformists, the remnants of the CCF and labor, between the West and the East.

Differences in the party, yes! But not a brawl and split. The unity of the party and the assurance that it can and will be a genuine instrument for social change lies in its democracy. The greatest danger to the party are those who think that unity can be organized, that unity means the quietening down, the harassing, even the suppression of minority views.. The strength of the party consists in the confidence that all ideas are given a hearing, that decisions genuinely and accurately reflect the will of the participants.

The new party founding convention opens up with a great debate on the nature of Canadian society and the role Canada should play in the world. Whatever the outcome of this debate the launching of the new party and the building of a grass roots structure opens up unparalleled opportunities to the workers of Canada.

Greetings and solidarity to the founding convention of the new party from the League for Socialist Action!

Forward

LESSONS OF CONFLICT IN BR LABOR PARTY

By P. KENT

According to **Toronto Star** correspondent Francis McCarthy, British Labor Party leader "Gaitskell is in firm command" and "this fall's party conference will support Mr. Gaitskell's policy — for keeping Britain in nuclear-armed NATO, keeping U.S. bomber bases . . ."

But last year's conference at Scarborough was a victory for the left! Not only did the right wing Gaitskell leadership of the party have to pull back in its efforts to rid the party of commitment to nationalization through the elimination of Clause 4 from the constitution, but the delegates defeated them on the question of war and peace. By some 407,000 votes the party was committed to a policy of unilateral disarmament; "Unilateral renunciation of the testing, manufacture, stockpiling and basing of all nuclear weapons in Great Britain."

Following that conference **The Financial Times** said "it amounts to a major defeat, and his (Gaitskell's) resignation sooner or later seems to be the only outcome."

How did it happen that Gaitskell is now in "firm command"? To be sure it was the arithmetic of the bloc vote that came to the aid of unilateralism last year, just as it is the bloc vote that is coming to Gaitskell's aid now, but the unilateralists did win at Scarborough last year and that laid the basis for a more decisive victory this year.

Even now it is highly doubtful that the number of unilateralists in Britain has declined since the last conference. The delegates to the Scottish Trade Union Congress, speaking for 800,000 workers, demanded on April 18-21 that Britain take the unilateral road by permanently ceasing to manufacture or test nuclear weapons, removing missile bases from the U.K. and ordering the Polaris base and ships from Holy Loch. The Co-op conference held at Easter saw the anti-NATO and the anti-cold war resolutions carried against the platform which had brought out all the big guns to defeat and reverse last year's position.

The first National Conference of the Young Socialists (LP youth), attended by some 360 delegates this Easter, endorsed with great enthusiasm the decisions of Scarborough on defence and nationalization. It called for British withdrawal from NATO and concluded: "Conference has no confidence in a leader of the party who persists in an undemocratic fight against Conference decisions and therefore calls for the resignation of Mr. Gaitskell as leader of the party."

Gaitskell at the time of his defeat described his opponents as pacifists, unilateralists and fellow travellers and declared that he would "fight and fight again" to retain the leadership of the party and to maintain in parliament support by Labor M.P.'s for the H-bomb. And while the left is strong, it has been the right that has carried the fight, by bureaucratic ukase and through the Campaign for Democratic Socialism, to organize the counter revolution against the conference decisions.

Not only did Gaitskell refuse to loyally abide by the decision of the Scarborough convention but he openly proceeded to break the unity of the party by constituting the parliamentary party composed of the MP's as a counter-bloc against the party position so that he could conduct his by-partisan policy with the Tories.

Those who remained loyal to the decisions of the party and attempted to carry them out he expelled from the parliamentary party. Five labor MP's, including Sydney Silverman, Emrys Hughes and Michael Foot, were expelled when they voted against the £527 Air Estimates, a considerable portion of which were to be spent on rockets and guided missiles. Labor MP Konni Zilliacus was expelled from the party by a National Executive Committee vote of 14 to 10.

LP Youth say Resign! But to speak to NP

HUGH GAITSKELL
defies convention decisions and expels MPs who uphold them

Transport House hasn't stood idly by in the youth area either. The editor of **New Advance**, "official" journal of the Labor Party youth, was physically barred from the platform of the youth conference by NEC officials and later sacked. For several months prior to the conference right wing agents had been busy propagating scare stories about Trotskyism to lay the basis for an NEC ban of the youth paper, **Keep Left**, which vigorously defends the Scarborough conference decisions. Yet despite the confusion created by the NEC the resolution moved by one of the clubs deploring the ban only lost by 148 votes to 172.

It has been the no-holds-barred attack by the Gaitskell leadership against the left, together with the confusion and lack of leadership of the left that lies behind the changed relationship of forces in the party. The left has the responsibility to attack and expose the Gaitskell leadership for flouting party policy and breaking the unity of the movement, and to counterpose a new leadership, but it has failed to do so.

The left in the parliamentary party proved unwilling to provide such an alternative. In the contest for leadership of the parliamentary party against Gaitskell it supported Harold Wilson who identifies himself with H-bombs for Britain.

Instead of taking a clear-cut position in defence of unilateralism, and the unstated implication of withdrawal from NATO, Frank Cousins of the Transport Workers and Michael Foot of the **Tribune** retreated to a variant of Gaitskell's **"defence" policy** slipped in by Richard Crossman and Walter Padley (let's have the bomb but 'we' won't use it first). This compromise only opened the door for Gaitskell. The Union of Shop Distributive and Allied Workers accepted the Crossman substitute while at the same time the delegates rejected the unilateralist position.

The Victory for Socialism Group has also failed to give a lead. At their annual conference they were more concerned with looking for Trotskyists under their chairs than in organizing the fight against Gaitskell. The net result is that Gaitskell's Campaign for Democratic Socialism can boast of victory after victory over VFS.

The revolutionary socialist wing of the left, organized in the Socialist Labor League, states in its press the **Newsletter** that "Gaitskell can win the next conference but he is quite unable to defeat the great movement for unilateralism and for a more socialist policy."

"If the left had stuck to the policy of the Scarborough conference and called upon the ranks in the trade unions and the Labor Party to support them in a national campaign to implement this policy, if they had constantly demanded action against Mr. Gaitskell who impudently flouted party decisions, then they would have forewarned and prepared the party against such betrayal."

The SLL sees the problem as one of leadership. "A new leadership must be built in the ranks of the left wing. There are many opportunities for doing this. Possibilities for united activity between the left in the Labor Party and the left in the trade unions are excellent. There is a growing Young Socialist movement which is developing rapidly in political maturity."

Workers' Vanguard #65 Mid-July 1961

Clip this coupon and mail it today to

THE WORKERS' VANGUARD

81 QUEEN STREET WEST TORONTO 1, ONTARIO

50¢ for 12 issues, $1.00 buys your sub and one for a friend

Name.....

Address.....

WV #65 Mid-July 1961
Editorials

THE
Published monthly
81 Queen S
EDITOR—ROSS D(
ARD
ishing Assoc.
6-1454
Subscriptions 50c a year (12 issues)

The policy of The Workers Vanguard is reflected in its editorials. Signed articles and features express the ideas of our contributors and do not necessarily represent the policies or opinion of The Workers' Vanguard.

Set up and printed by Merchants Press, 323 King St. W., Toronto
Authorized as Second Class matter, Post Office Department, Ottawa

Mid-July '61

Stoking the Fires of the Cold War

The cause, the "challenge" making it necessary, has been lost in the agitation and hysteria, in the fearsome scope, of U.S. President Kennedy's arms drive.

The simple facts in the case are that Khrushchov has said that he will delay no longer in signing a seperate treaty with East Germany as did the NATO powers with West Germany and Japan without asking his leave. There is a proposal about Berlin, but nothing to even suggest the closing of access routes to this monstrosity carved out of the prostrate body of Germany by the victors of World War II.

The Berlin crisis is a manufactured crisis, whipped up and shaped by the cold warriors of the Pentagon to jam through a vast new militarization program, not only on the American people but on the Canadian people and on all peoples tied by reactionary governments to the NATO military alliance.

In one flash is revealed the absurdity of the proposition that Canada must be in NATO and OAS to influence U.S. policy. All these devices, including the U.N. itself, are factors in U.S. capitalist diplomacy only in so far as they serve as instruments for policies designed solely to make the world safe for capitalism.

There is one force that can make Amrican capitalism and its political mouthpieces see reason: that is the American working class who are going to have to pay the bill. The Canadian working class through their organization of the new labor party have a unique opportunity to strengthen the efforts of those in the U.S. who are trying to build an American counterpart, which alone can settle accounts with U.S. capitalism on its home grounds.

A tremendous project it is true but Kennedy's arms drive and the new brinksmanship points up the completely illusory character of all other propositions.

The James Coyne Affair

Mid-July '61

What has been called the Coyne affair proved to be little more than a spat, a fall out, in Ottawa cocktail circles when the Diefenbaker government demonstrated in its latest budget that it agreed one hundred per cent with the former governor of the Bank of Canada's warning of over the past year and a half that "we" have been living too high on the hog, been spending too much, buying too heavy abroad, etc.

The working people will all be buying cheaper cuts what with the devaluation of the dollar and resulting price hoists on all goods and services imported into Canada, particularly on American goods that figure so heavily in the Canadian standard of living. And we won't even be able to stuff up on bread for, despite Mr. Fleming's pious words that there is no basis for a price increase here, the bakery moguls have decided to gouge a cent more a loaf out of the family budget.

And you are mistaken if you think that the dropping of the seven and one-half per cent excise tax on cars is going to mean cheaper prices — it's going to mean higher profits. According to MP Lionel Chevrier auto prices are moving higher. What Fleming dropped is being picked up in part by his fellow Tories in Ontario whose 3% sales tax will be snapping at us this September. Besides, with the devaluation of the Canadian dollar, British exports, including cheaper British cars, will be more expensive on the Canadian market and will free the Canadian auto tycoons of this pesky price irritant.

But there was one aspect of the Coyne affair that Mr. Diefenbaker probably didn't count on but which we will give odds on will provide him with what he has been searching for — a new gimmick to replace last election campaign's "vision" which has become clouded if not, as one wit said, become an actual nightmare to the Canadian people. The next election, when it comes, will see Mr. Diefenbaker storming the length and breadth of the country in a crusade for Canadian democracy — top billing going to a program of Senate reform.

This issue has been handed to him on a platter by the Liberals who, while agreeing that Coyne had outlived his usefulness, decided to give him his day in court before casting him aside. It was indeed ironical to witness the Liberals, whose decades of rule had allowed them to pack the Senate, present that body which is a travesty of the democratic process as a bulwark of civic virtue.

Diefenbaker will expose the Senate as a body of aging faithfuls of the Liberal machine, even suggesting that they are part of a corrupt financial hierarchy out of touch with the needs of the people. He will probably urge a retirement age so that he can clear out the Liberal gang and pack his boys in, and even suggest the setting up of some kind of advisory board to remove the stigma of narrow partisanship from future appointments. This will all be proposed in keeping with that hoary myth that the Senate is an agency designed to give second thought to decisions made in the house.

There is one proposition that he will not make and that is that the Senate should be torn up root and branch. For with the formation of the new labor party and the coming to power of an anti-capitalist government the Senate is yet to play the role for which it was created—to preserve private property in the means of production — to preserve the capitalist system.

Diefenbaker will urge its reform but you can be sure that he will retain this, its essential content. Thus to establish political democracy, for you don't have it until you can change the economic system, the first task of a labor government will be to abolish the Senate.

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOUNDED
JOIN IT, BUILD IT, TO WIN POWER

The Workers Vanguard

Mid-August 1961 Vol. 6, No. (6) (66) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

Mid Aug '61

Big Union Representation At Stirring Convention

Nothing is ever going to be the same again in this country, with the founding of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa this month. For those who produce all the wealth but who have no real control over any aspect of their lives, the working people, now have for the first time a party of their own which can, and which the 1,801 voting delegates who assembled in Lansdowne Hall are determined will, form workers' and farmers' governments in Ottawa and in the provinces.

It was an inspiring convention, with great moments of controversy, conflict, unity and solidarity. It was conceded by the hundreds of newspapermen who covered it for the national and international press, radio and TV, that it dwarfed on all counts, in size, in intensity of interest and participation, in enthusiasm, the Liberal, Progressive Conservative and Social Credit gatherings that had assembled in the same hall only months previously.

NDP leader Douglas

All told there were 681 union delegates representing bodies affiliated to 49 national or international unions. Some 76 BC unionists participated in defiance of the Social Credit government's legislation baring the use of union funds for political purposes. There were 707 delegates representing the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, 248 representing white collar and professional people organized in New Party clubs, and 53 from the militant Newfoundland Democratic Party.

While no farm organizations were fomally represented, in the mass of delegates the faces of many well-known leaders from the farm movement were discernible. Particularly notable were the some 200 delegates from French-speaking Quebec and the scores of youth identified with the anti-bomb movement.

In the five days of intensive, often acrimonious debate, which had lighter moments such as the mass song-fest under the leadership of labor's troubador Joe Glazer and the death march for the Liberal and Tory-labelled coffins during the electrifying nominat-

to page 2

WV #66 Mid-August 1961

page 2

ions session, the delegates proved to be firmly united in their great purpose of launching the first mass labor party on the North American continent. But within the framework of that unity there were wide differences—not solved by the debates or the formal votes, but the solution of which awaits new experiences.

The wiseacres, the mouthpieces and apologists for the capitalists status quo were full of malicious predictions that the new party would never get underway but would founder on the conflict between labor and farmer, East and West, between CCFer and trade unionist. But not only did the party get underway with a full head of steam, these didn't in anyway prove to be the divisions.

The big controversy was on what kind of policy the new party should have—whether it should have a firm and consistant anti-capitalist program or whether it should have a reformist, make capitalism work, policy. The division that the debates and the votes on the major questions before the assembly revealed was an unmistakable and persistant one between the platform and the floor, between the CCF-trade union bureaucracy and the CCF and trade union rank and filer. Thus democracy was an overriding issue at this convention.

Despite vigorous opposition of the ranks, which on many occasions resulted in touch and go decisions, the CCF-trade union bureaucracy prevailed. Thus the party got underway with a program that is far from adequate to the great tasks looming before it. Instead of advancing a program that will unite the workers and working farmers of this country in a serious struggle in defense of and for the extension of their interests, the NDP has been saddled with a peaceful coexistence with Canadian capitalism program—where it is defined at all, a patchwork of peicemeal reforms. Consistant with this, instead of casting Canada in a new role on the world political arena, instead of speaking up as a forthright anti-war anti-NATO force, the new party has been committed to continue the Liberal-Tory alignment of the Canadian people behind a foreign policy of defence of capitalism on the European continent and colonialism in Africa and Asia.

But the new labor party comes onto the scene at a time of developing crisis at home and a rising curve of successful anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist struggles abroad. Nothing, neither demagogy of the leadership nor bureaucratic restraints on the rank and file can shelter the new party from the impact of these events. Already the leadership's policies are being riddled with fissures. Subsequent events are certain to reveal their falseness to ever-widening ranks of the Canadian working class who are looking to the new party to meet their needs and aspirations.

The high anticipation and expectations of the Canadian workers in the new party was demonstrated by the large number of delegates from the unions in basic industry, from Steel, Auto, Packinghouse and Textile. There was also strong representation from many of the key, strategic craft unions. The United Packinghouse Workers Union already has approval from locals representing 17,000 of its 21,000 members to affiliate to the New Democratic Party.

At long last the working class of Canada has a mass political party of its own. It is within this party, through their experiences in struggle with the capitalist class and their political lackeys in the Liberal, Tory and Social Credit parties that they will test the contending views and through which they will forge the leadership which will construct a socialist Canada of peace and plenty.

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON QUESTION OF NUCLEAR WARHEADS FOR CANADA

In his remarks to the house on September 20, Prime Minister Diefenbaker refused to grant any assurance that parliament would be given another opportunity to discuss the nuclear armament of Canadian forces before a decision is reached. No agreement would be signed to accept nuclear warheads from the US, he said, with the cynical qualification, "while progress towards disarmament continues" — meaning, pending a response to US President Kennedy's proposals in the UN.

But Kennedy's "truce on terror" speech to the UN, hailed by the daily press as a bid to stop further tests and a move towards peace, doesn't by any stretch of the imagination amount to a pulling back on the part of the Pentagon in its efforts to see Canadian forces nuclear armed. On the contrary, CCF MP Harold Winch made the observation that the Kennedy wording "is an open invitation for Canada to obtain nuclear arms."

The pertinent wording in Kennedy's address, which reveals its total hypocricy, is "prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not now own them." Under joint control, which is the US proposition to Canada, the US would not technically transfer control and would not surrender ownership of nuclear warheads.

Now there can be no mistake about the valuelessness of appeals to Mr. Diefenbaker and his government not to enmesh Canada in the nuclear arm race.

For the Diefenbaker government there is no question that Canada is to be nuclear armed—there is only one last decision to be made—the determination of the exact moment when to roll up the warheads to be fitted into all the military devices with which Canadian armed forces are now equipped and partly trained.

While Diefenbaker went through the act of expressing fear that the US State Department might take too unyielding a stand over Berlin, might go too far in exploiting a situation which Britain's prime minister cracked was manufactured by the press, he worked the Berlin crisis to the limit. Over the protests of Finance Minister Fleming who tabled a two months old treasury board report to the effect that 10 — 20,000 men in the armed forces could be cut out without reducing efficiency and effectiveness, the cabinet whipped through the house a bill adding another 15,000 men.

To further soften up resistance to its nuclear arms drive, the government, with the full support of the house, authorized the recruitment of a civilian survival force of up to 100,000 who will

→to page 2

The Workers Vanguard

Mid-September 1961 Vol. 6, No. (7) (67) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

WV #67 Mid-Sept. 1961

page 2

man some 210 mobile rescue columns. They will carry out mass propaganda operations to overcome resistance to the war preparations. Already this has resulted in a massive fall-out shelter campaign to convince the public that Canada can survive an H Bomb war and thus could go into a war with its nuclear weapons.

Then, like manna from above came a gift from the Soviet bureaucracy—its announcement to resume the testing of nuclear weapons, its preparations to manufacture superbombs and, in rapid fire succession, a whole series of tests which have sent the

dread fallout count soaring right across the country—in Toronto the highest ever recorded.

Mr. Diefenbaker joyously seized these developments, which struck a body blow at all those who have participated in the anti-test, unilateralist demonstrations over the past years, to further strengthen his drive to nuclear arm Canada. He never uttered a peep when Washington sent a note last June 17 threatening to recommence the tests that it had been forced to suspend after the Kremlin took the initiative and declared a moratorium. Now he brazenly declared, when the US immediately grasped the opportunity to resume testing, that "they could take no other course."

External Affairs Minister Green, upon whose much touted differences with Defence Minister Harkness many naive people were counting to restrain the drive to nuclear arms, leaped in behind the government's strengthening of military and civilian forces. He warned that Canadians would have to give up their soft way of life and face the hard road ahead of tension for a long time.

All that was left was for Harkness to make the open pitch for nuclear arms. After explaining that Canadian forces already have three weapons systems which have nuclear capabilities, he made a strong bid to give them nuclear warheads to "maintain the credibility" of their deterrent force.

Time is running out. There is precious little left if we are to keep nuclear arms out of Canada. The nuclear arms petition with its tens of thousands of signatures should be presented to the government immediately and a new petition got underway. This petition should be of such a character as to not only point up the widespread opposition to nuclear arms, which the Diefenbaker government is fully aware of and has been patiently wearing down, but one that can mobilize the people of Canada against the government. It should demand that we decide this crucial matter as to whether Canada has nuclear arms or not through a referendum.

Both the CCF-NDP and the Canadian Labor Congress are committed to opposition to nucler arms. The leadership must meet their responsibility by using every means at their disposal to mobilize a mighty campaign behind the demand for a referendum on the question of nuclear arms. The Diefenbaker government has no mandate to proceed on this mad course. It could be forced to go to the electorate on this question. A massive campaign behind the demand for a vote on nuclear arms could stop the Diefenbaker government in its tracks and force an election on this life and death matter.

→ to page 3

WV #67 Mid-Sept. 1961
Editorials

Page 3

Keep McCarthyism Out of New Democratic Party

BY THE EDITORS Mid Sept '61

The membership of unions affiliated to the New Democratic Party and they alone should have the authority to determine who shall represent them at NDP conventions. Nothing new in that—that's basic down-to-earth, elementary, democracy. Any other method of determining representation is not only a violation of the membership's rights but is a ready-made argument with which opponents of independent labor political action in the unions can belabor the NDP and hinder its growth.

But that's not the way things are going to be if the top brass of the Ontario NDP have their way. The Ontario NDP founding convention call issued to all locals in the Sept.-Oct. OFL-PAC Memo repeats the restrictive qualifications outlined in the Jan.-Feb. issue, While repeating that no one can be a delegate who is a member or supporter of any other political party, and not so much as mentioning the mortal enemies of the NDP, the Liberal, Progressive Conservative

(See page 3—FOR DEMOCRACY)

→ to left columns

(Continued from page 1)

and Social Credit parties, it goes out of its way to declare that a delegate must not be a member of or associated with Communist, Trotskyist or totalitarian groups or any of their front organizations."

This arrogant intervention in the rights of union affiliates must be defeated on two counts: (1) that it is in direct contravention of the federal constitution of the NDP adopted at the founding convention just two months ago, and (2) that it is a clear violation of elementary democracy which reeks of the stench of McCarthyism, and its most vile aspect at that, since it promotes the concept of guilt not for concrete acts or deeds but by association.

The constitution of the NDP which deals with membership in the party was adopted by the 1,800 delegates, including some 700 union delegates, at the founding convention after the specific rejection of an attempt by Toronto Steel staffman Sefton to insert this very clause into it. With no authority whatsoever for their action the Ontario brass have made the conditions of union representation more restrictive than actual membership in the party itself.

The Communist Party exists as a party. Its position on the NDP is readily ascertainable. It has already declared that the next election will see it contest the NDP for seats. But what is a Communist, Trotskyist or totalitarian group, or front organization? Why aren't they named? And who determines that they are inimicable to the NDP, and on what basis? In what way does this differ from the hated McCarthyism that started with harassing unpopular minorities to reach right up into the highest offices of government, that became the major tool of the union-busters and for so long stultified American life?

The term Trotskyism has long been used by the CCF brass, not to define a socialist tendency with which they are in disagreement, but as a smear against their opponents. It was the late Liberal Minister of Labor Humprey Mitchell who snarled across the house "He talks like a Trotskyite", at a CCF MP who dared to express opposition to Canada becoming part of NATO. This took place under the watchful eyes of M. J. Coldwell who was pressing the MP's into line to repudiate the party's commitment to oppose NATO. Celebrating the demise of the Regina Manifesto at a 25th anniversary supper of the CCF, M. J. Coldwell was so bold as to characterize the Toronto representatives at the founding convention as Trotskyists.

The bar that has been imposed, by persons with no authority whatsoever to do so, without presentation of evidence, or holding of hearings, against delegates designated as Communists, Trotskyists, totalitarians or persons associated with such, is a factional device. It is being imposed by the reformists and is designed to block those who are now, and who they suspect might become in the future, an opposition to their policies in the party. And it won't stop with those who are now advocating an anti-NATO policy and socialist perspective.

Since their first pronouncement of this McCarthyite policy the right wing hasn't remained idle. In their dying gasps, in a final blow against the future, those who destroyed the old CCF have launched a purge against the left. They have refused to renew memberships of several longstanding left-wing activists and have turned down applications of others with the intention of jeopardizing their getting memberships in the New Democratic Party.

Make no mistake, this is not just of concern to those who are now being harassed, but to all NDP supporters. Democracy is a key question. Only through the free clash and exchange of ideas is there any assurance that the NDP will be a responsive instrument of the workers and arrive at the correct program. Open the NDP to all who support it! Let's have a party that is really new and genuinely democratic, as its name proclaims!

Call Off RCMP . . . Greet Williams

Mid-Sept '61

Canada was an asylum, a place of refuge during the days of the great abolitionist struggles prior to the American Civil War for all Negroes who were being hunted down by the Southern slave owners and white supremacists. Today the struggle in the U.S. South is reaching a new peak with new heroes and new martyrs. Should freedom fighter Robert F. Williams seek refuge in Canada from the white supremacist authorities of Monroe, North Carolina, Canada should be true to its past honorable tradition and welcome him.

But the RCMP, in collusion with the FBI, is attempting to enlist the aid of the public to track Williams down. On September 6 they released a photo of Williams and information that depicts him as a criminal fleeing before a charge of kidnapping. As if to encourage police officers to shoot him on sight the RCMP story describes him as "dangerous," possibly "armed with a 45 calibre pistol . . . and a large supply of ammunition."

There is nothing in the RCMP manhunt cry to even suggest that Williams is a leader of U.S.-wide reputation in the Negro rights movement and is involved in a civil rights struggle.

The truth is, and the evidence already available shows beyond any doubt, that Williams is completely innocent of the charge. It is a frame-up and a declaration by the FBI, aided and abetted by the RCMP, that Williams is outlaw—subject to Southern style lynch-law justice.

The CCF-NDP members in the house, all defenders of civil rights and justice, all opponents of racism, should demand that the RCMP be instructed to cease collaborating on any basis whatsoever with the FBI in this manhunt. Furthermore the government should be asked to declare in our name that Canada welcomes Williams to step across the border, along with anyone else seeking sanctuary from the 1961 version the Fugitive Slave Law, and will aid him in his fight to see that justice is done to the New York Freedom Rider and the two members of the Monroe Non-Violent Action Committee who are being held in the Monroe jail on the same kidnap frame-up.

Workers' Vanguard #67 Mid-Sept. 1961

Communist Party Sharply Assails Fundamental Character of NDP

Mid-Sept '61

BY P. KENT

Any illusions as to the Communist Party's position on the New Democratic Party can now be dispelled. Some might have thought that its failure to identify itself with the movement heretofore flowed from some doubts as to its future, an inability on the part of the CP to read all the signs correctly. But now the New Democratic Party is a tremendous reality and was revealed by the Ottawa convention to be firmly based on the organized labor movement and with strong ties with the working farmers—to be a full blown labor party.

The national executive committee of the Communist Party has issued a rounded statement on the founding convention of the NDP which spells out its views in a way scarcely capable of being misunderstood.

Of course the CP states its disappointment that the NDP failed to take an anti-NATO stand, that it excluded "from its ranks on the basis of divisive anti-communism many unions and other organizations including the CP itself." But that is not the real trouble with the NDP as the CP sees it. So fundamental is the CP's disagreement with the NDP that it can in no way at all identify itself with the left which hails the party as a force for independent working class political action and seeks to give it a class struggle program and a socialist objective. Nor can it identify itself with the leadership of the party, for on the political spectrum it stands even farther to the right. It disagrees with the basic character of the NDP.

What is wrong with the NDP, according to the CP, is that it is a class party—a party of the working people launched in opposition to the other class parties—Liberal, Progressive Conservative, Social Credit—parties of the capitalist class. What the CP desired the NDP to be, and still hopes that it will become, is "a democratic national coalition of patriotic forces for peace, Canadian independence, and social progress." That is the aim that it projects for the "progressive and patriotic forces" now in the party.

As if to make it clear to anyone who might still think that the CP is sympathetic to those persons in the NDP who fought for a socialist policy, the NEC address itself to them specifically. While tipping its hat to them "we suggest," says the NEC, "that they consider the constituency (the group of supporters) that the NDP is designed to represent and upon which it must be based." The left was all wrong, it couldn't have been more wrong in supporting the party as a working class formation and seeking to give it a socialist policy. According to the CP it should have fought to make the NDP a coalition party, a coalition of labor and patriotic capital, against the CLC-CCF leadership who, despite grave programmatic inconsistencies, affirmed the NDP as a class party. According to the CP the left should have fought to make the NDP "a democratic national coalition of patriotic forces for peace, Canadian independence and social progress."

In the next sentence the CP NEC lectures the left, which is correctly attempting to fuse its forces with this mass political movement of the Canadian workers by marching arm in arm with it in its struggles and thus win the NDP to socialism, that it is in error. It grandly pontificates: "The party of socialism in Canada is the Communist Party."

Of course the top brass of the NDP can read all this as well as anyone else, for it's written up in the Sept. 1st **Pacific Tribune** and the Aug. 28 **Canadian Tribune**. Yet in the Ontario NDP convention call where they decree who is to be barred from being a delegate, they link together Communist and Trotskyist; those who are firmly opposed to the essential character of the NDP and seek to destroy it as a force for independent working class action, with those who are its loyal supporters as it is now and who seek, as is their democratic right, to give it the clarity and consistancy of a socialist policy. It is apparent that this bureaucratic ordinance is not all based on an analysis of the various views but is a device to smear and lay the basis for the elimination of any and all opposition. As such it must be soundly defeated.

The Workers' Vanguard

Mid-October 1961 Vol. 6, No. (8) (68) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

ONT. NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY UNDERWAY WITH HIGH PROMISE

By ROSS DOWSON

Almost 1,200 delegates, a third more than anticipated by even the most optimistic, well over half of them representing key unions, launched the Ontario section of the New Democratic Party at Niagara Falls on Thanksgiving weekend.

In this respect the convention carried forward the great promises of last August's Ottawa founding of the federal party that the working people of Canada are moving forward to build a mass labor-farmer party. The Falls' convention also more clearly defined some of the problems involved in making the movement a democratic instrument of the workers in the struggle to transform Canada from a society geared to war preparations and plagued by unemployment into a new social order of peace and prosperity.

Despite the inspiring response to the convention call it was a dead convention, sadly lacking in the inspiration, the drama, the stimulating conflict in ideas that made the Ottawa launching such a tremendous experience. The only measurable burst of enthusiasm was sparked by the address of NDP federal leader T. C. Douglas which for all the trimmings was an expression of classic 19th century liberal dogma.

First, there were no socialists in any effective force to act as a stimulant and ferment of ideas —it would appear that the CCF brass' anti - socialist campaign over the years has eliminated such elements from those ranks, or at least driven them into silence. Furthermore there was little opportunity and almost no time allotted for discussion of any important political questions, either of a federal or provincial character. Almost all the convention time was taken up with constitutional matters—the bits and patches draft program was presented as merely a report, with a promise that a draft of a complete provincial program will be presented to next year's convention.

But three factors intervened to give the convention a lift and to block efforts to saddle the party with a constitution that would have seriously crippled it from becoming a fighting political force for the working people of this province.

In the opening session of the convention, in the first matter of debate, Article 2 of the Draft Constitution entitled Principles, two youthful delegates representing Toronto New Democratic Youth clubs, John Wilson, West Toronto, and Dick Fidler, East Toronto, appeared at the mikes to urge that the party project before the people of Ontario the vision of a new society based on the public ownership of the means of production. This effort of the young socialists won no response from the delegates, in fact it became the source of a series of snide comments by the brass during the process of the convention.

Nonetheless it was the further intervention of the scattering of socialists, combined with the fact that possibly as high as a third of the delegates were newcomers, uncommitted to the old alignments, together with the fact that the CCF and trade union machines were themselves divided on some important questions, that launched the Ontario section off with high promise.

In the face of the obvious reluctance of right wing forces, the Ontario convention publicly affirmed the party's opposition to

(See Page 4—Ont. NDP)

EVADES RCMP NET WILLIAMS IN CUBA

Rows of press correspondents in Havana, Cuba, were witness to the fact that North Carolina Negro civil rights leader Robert F. Williams has been successful in eluding a month long manhunt by the FBI, the Canadian RCMP, and the Mexican police. On October 3 the Cuban government announced that it had granted asylum to Williams, framed by North Carolina racists on a charge of kidnapping.

Vernal Olson, of the Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which Williams spoke before in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver has initiated a committee to assist the US "Committee to Aid the Monroe Defendents."

The committee is circulating information on the Williams case and the circumstances confronting other victims of the Monroe racists.

Funds to meet the costs of this work and to aid the US committee are needed and should be sent to 21 Ellis Gardens, Toronto.

to page 2

WV #68 Mid-Oct 1961

from page 1

Ont. New Democratic Party Underway with High Promise

Continued from Page 1)

nuclear arms on Canadian soil. The delegates launched the Ontario section as a broadly based party, over the protests of many prominent CCF and trade union leaders, by overwhelmingly passing a low membership fee of $2.50. And after a sharp debate on a narrow majority it strengthened this by granting affiliate members of the party full voice and vote in constituency nomination meetings. In the closing hours the delegates decisively rejected an attempt of the leadership to impose a McCarthyite membership bar which could have been used against any opposition to their policies at any time in the future.

It was Dick Fidler who introduced the emergency resolution accepted by the program committee which endorsed the federal NDP policy of unconditional opposition to nuclear weapons on Canadian soil and urged an expression of solidarity with the anti-nuclear arms demonstration taking place at that very moment in front of the parliament buildings in Ottawa. NDPY University of Toronto leader Al Shapiro entered into the debate to sweep aside the diversionary arguments of the opposition and point up the fact that there was no question upon which NDP leader Douglas in the previous evening's address had been more emphatic. The attempts of such right wingers as CPA correspondent John Brewin to get the resolution off the floor were defeated and the delegates voted overwhelmingly for the resolution.

The big schism between the CCF and the trade union brass, according to advance press comments, was to be the question of whether the executive was to be elected from the floor, including the post of financial secretary, or appointed by and from an elected provincial council. The delegates voted decisively to elect the executive officers but would have had no opportunity to elect the secretary treasurer but for the fact that a rank and file activist from Toronto Greenwood, Sharon Lambert, entered the contest against former CCF provincial secretary Peg Stewart. The latter won the post, but one third of the delegates abstained from voting.

The debate on membership fees saw Stewart and other leaders of the defunct CCF strenuously plea that it be set at $4.00 thereby assuring the machine a stable source of revenue and guaranteeing circulation of the party press which as the **CCF News** was a sterile house organ. But the delegates cast a decisive vote for a minimum membership fee of $2.50, expressing a strong desire to let nothing stand in the way of building a mass membership and their confidence that the party could raise needed funds on this basis.

Those in opposition to opening constituency meetings to affiliate members mouthed some of the most reactionary arguments devised by the boss opposition to the NDP—that labor would dominate the party, UAW PAC director Art Schultz referred to "dangers here that are not mentioned," undefined differences in the unions that he said "we don't want to come into our party." David Lewis' appeal not to be afraid of too many people at nominations meetings, but of too few, and Bill Sefton's observation that two years ago in one riding eight persons chose the candidate whereas this year the hall was overflowing, won a narrow majority to adopt the rule to open the meetings to all affiliate members living in the riding and registered with the secretary 30 days before nominations.

The convention call that went out to union affiliates denied them the right to elect whoever they chose by barring persons "members of or associated with Communist, Trotskyist or totalitarian groups, or any of their front organizations." The draft constitution contained no such McCarthyite stricture. But the constitution committee came down with an amendment to the constitution that would not only impose this McCarthyite provision on delegates from unions but on individual membership too, and for good measure, on bodies seeking affiliation.

Francis Eady, chairman of the defunct Toronto District CCF Council, earlier in the convention, set the stage in his attack on a resolution presented by delegate John Morgan on behalf of Steel Local 1005. The resolution urged that the draft be amended to allow members expelled, suspended or disciplined, to appeal not only to the provincial council but to the convention itself, as is common in the union movement and was the case in the old CCF. Eady charged that this would be "too much democracy" and referred to the expulsion from the CCF some six years previous of Trotskyists who he claimed in their appeal took up 1½ days of a three day convention. Just before the debate opened up on this attack on the left, chairman David Archer, president of the OFL, made an announcement sharply dissociating the **Workers Vanguard** from the convention.

But this was all upended by the first speaker, Jack Meteer of Sussex County CCF. Meteer challenged: Who is going to decide whether a group is dominated or controlled? He pointed out how liberals and progressives were hounded to death in another country when certain forces assumed such power. He protested that should the executive declare the Fair Play for Cuba Committee a "front" it would be declaring him to be guilty by association, whereas conduct only can be the basis for action against anyone.

Meteer's contribution set the framework to the debate and placed the CCF-TU brass on the defensive. Cutting into the discussion was a question from Norman Davison, NDP-MLA, as to whether this amendment would make him inelegible for indivudual membership. When this was ignored another voice cried: "Does this mean Mr. Davison is not our member of parliament?"

Embarrased, chairman Grube turned to the constitution committee whose spokesman replied "this was not our intention but it could be read into the amendment." During the ensuing consternation and confusion, as the amendment was going under, David Lewis cut in to claim that the amendment was unnecessary as the original wording meant this —and the vote for leaving the constitution as drafted carried overwhelmingly.

Workers' Vanguard #68 Mid-Oct. 1961 — Editorials

Take up West Coast Union's Nuclear Arms Referendum!

BY THE EDITORS

Mid-October 19
1961

As the Diefenbaker government was sneaking Bomarc missiles across the border through hidden points of entry and over secret routes to North Bay, in fear that there would be demonstrations against these weapons that are only really operational if they have nuclear warheads, a section of the BC labor movement was giving a lead which should be taken up by the New Democratic Party and the entire anti-nuclear arms movement.

Local 76, the Ocean Falls B.C. local of the Pulp and Sulphite Workers Union, is conducting a referendum vote by ballot on the question of whether Canada should have nuclear arms and has asked the Western Canada Council of that union to conduct such a vote throughout its membership. The Prince Rupert local has concurred with this action and has decided to go ahead at once with a similar referendum throughout its ranks.

Time is short. The government is only too well aware that the Canadian people are opposed to nuclear arms—it has been patiently trying to wear down this opposition for the past several years, all the while inexorably moving in the direction of full commitment to the nuclear arms race. The No Nuclear Arms in Canada petition was a mighty declaration to the government of the Canadian peoples' opposition to its course. Now it is necessary to mobilize our forces against the government—a government which has no mandate from the people for its perilous conduct.

The **Vanguard** was exhilarated when the demand for a popular referendum on the question of nuclear arms in Canada was given voice by John B. Witchell last February to 2,000 who attended a Vancouver Radiation Hazards meeting. Now an important West Coast Union is swinging into motion along these lines.

The action of the West Coast Pulp and Sulphite workers must spread through the labor movement and must be taken up by the entire anti-nuclear arms movement through the mobilization of a mighty petition campaign to force the government to let the people themselves make the decision on this life and death matter.

For an End to All Tests

The men in the Pentagon are already talking of setting off in a matter of a few weeks a whole series of tests with the argument that they are necessary "to prevent the USSR from pulling ahead in the arms race." A former US under secretary of state for political affairs, Robert Murphy, made the pitch to a Montreal audience for an increase in the sky-high US military budget and was so brazen as to declare that his government should no longer assure the world that it would never strike first.

Defence Minister Harkness has opened up a new campaign for the acceptance of nuclear warheads for the Bomarcs that are being wheeled into North Bay, so that we can "maintain the credibility of the deterrent." External Affair Minister Green, whose department was quiet and did nothing in protest against US and French nuclear tests, is busy making headlines in the world press against nuclear tests, while his government records with solid satisfaction an increasing acceptance and resignation to a nuclear war on the part of the Canadian people through the new wave of interest in its fallout shelter blue-prints and its civil emergency forces.

(See Page 3—END ALL)

to page 2

WV #68 Mid-Oct. 1961 – Page 2

continued from page 1

(Continued from page 1)

The irony of it all is that the excuse, the justification for the feverish upswing in the arms race and the new wave of brinkmanship has been handed on a platter to the members of the NATO war alliance by the Soviet government—by its series of murderous nuclear tests, by Khruschev's employment of the strategy of the deterrent, the military aspect of his theory of peaceful co-existence.

The progress of the anti-nuclear arms movements, given impetus by the Soviet moratorium on tests which compelled the US to bow to world public opinion, has been slowed down and diverted. The great Soviet technological achievements springing out of the planned economy combined to give substance to our contention that a planned economy is inherently peaceful and did much to undo the cold war-bred fear and hostility to the USSR.

But now the revolutionary youth of Japan organized in Zengakuren and who led the great anti-war demonstrations against Eisenhower are picketing the Soviet Embassy. The aggessive opponents of nuclear arms gathered around British philosopher Bertrand Russell are directing their fire against the USSR. The CUCND 73-hour vigil before the Ottawa house of parliament closed with a demonstration against the Soviet Embassy there.

And understandably too. No matter how hypocritical the protests of the Kennedy's, the Macmillan's, the Diefenbaker's and their hangers-on, is it not true that Every Test Kills? Don't the Soviet tests kill—the first, second, third, the 23rd involving a 30 megaton bomb, and the 50 megaton blast scheduled for the end of this month?

Linus Pauling estimates that for every 20 megaton explosion 15,000 die and 15,000 will be deformed. Krushchev's latest 30 megaton test, which his Ottawa representative pronounced was a "domestic affair," has alone showered Canada with more radio-active debris than all other nuclear weapons previously detonated. By the tests alone the Soviet bureaucracy has committed a monstrous crime against the people of the world including the Soviet peoples who will suffer the greatest fallout.

But added to the criminal deed of further polluting the atmosphere with deadly fallout is the impact of the strategy behind it on the anti-war fight, on the varied forces that are attempting to intervene against the war drive. In answer to the protests of the Japanese anti-nuclear tests movement, Krushchev merely rephrased the standard argument worked up by the US State Department and its hangers-on. He said that the Soviet tests are designed to prevent attacks by the Western powers and argued that the development of bigger nuclear bombs would help prevent war, although Soviet Defence Minister Marshall Malinovsky boasted to the 22nd Congress CPSU that "the problem of destroying rockets in flight has been successfully solved," by the USSR.

Repeating another argument that spokesmen of the NATO alliance use to justify their policies he told interviewing British Labor Party MP's that he wished to "shock" the Western powers into negotiating on Germany and disarmament.

But is there any evidence of any kind to prove that the construction of bigger and more devestating bombs in the hands of the Soviet forces will deter—particularly in view of the use to which the Western militarists are putting this argument, in order to construct even bigger and more devestating ones of their own.

Aud suppose after talking so tough Krushchev offers terms and the Western powers think the situation is such as to cause them to negotiate. What evidence is there to sustain any idea that summitry at this time will be any more effective than previous summitry to the winning of world peace, that anything more than a new equilibrium to be upset at a later date will be arrived at?

The USSR requires a military defence against rapacious imperialism, it needs to take advantage of every contradiction in the capitalist world to undermine the agessive capacities of imperialism. But the road to peace lies not in status quo deals with imperialism which the Soviet bureaucracy seeks; not in peaceful coexistence. Nor does its defence reside in bigger bombs.

It lies in the strength of the Soviet peoples, whose courage and will to struggle, as Krushchev himself revealed was so gravely undermined by Stalin and whose policies as leader of the bureaucracy Krushchev follows when he deprives the Soviet peoples of all knowledge let alone any say about the tests committed in their name.

Not Krushchev's cynicism and contempt for the people of the world but the revolutionary socialist policies of Lenin and Trotsky designed to raise the level of class consciousness and combativity of the workers against capitalism are the road to peace. Progress along this road and the real defence of the USSR lies in the victory, not the betrayal of the Iraq revolution, in all-out support, not manipulation of the Algerian revolution, and above all in policies that aid, not disorient the struggle against capitalism, particularly in its centers of imperialist power.

This requires socialists without any equivocation to condemn the Soviet tests—all the more so that they can prepare a new drive to block the nuclear armament of Canadian forces and mobilize the strength to stop resumption of US tests.

Stalin 'Cult' Felled by Soviet Masses

By P. KENT

Mid Nov '61

The 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union heralded a new era in the USSR. The destruction of the Stalin cult, dramatized by the removal of the bloody dictator's mummy from the mausoleum it shared with Lenin's and a widespread removal of his image and his name from public buildings and cities etc., in the Soviet Union, East Germany and other Soviet areas, is the biggest concession yet by his heirs to the desire of the Soviet peoples for democratization of their society.

The Soviet masses want an end to Stalinism with its rule by police terror, its rigid thought-control and regimentation, its sacrifice of their immediate welfare for pie in the sky, its vast wage differentials, its Great Russian chauvinism and contempt for minority peoples and anti-Semitism, etc. Khrushchov rode the crest of this massive sentiment which even broke out in the closely controlled congress and was expressed in student gatherings and meetings of factory workers during the sessions with his denunciations of the past and his promises of the future.

Khrushchov directed this protest against the so-called "anti-party group" composed of his former rivals, Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov, Vorishilov and Shepilov. By labelling them Stalinists he hoped to utilize them as scapegoats and to utterly destroy them.

He also utilized the hatred of Stalinism to strike out against Peking which has been opposing his foreign policy, by launching a massive attack against a stalking horse, against the tiny Al-

(See page 2—SOVIET MASSES)

The Workers Vanguard

Mid-November 1961 Vol. 6, No. (9) (69) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

to page 2

WV #69 Mid-Nov. 1961 page 2

Soviet Masses Force End of the Stalin "Cult"

(Continued from page 1)

banian Communist Party, and its gangster-First Secretary Hoxha, for its practice of the Stalin cult.

This latter action initiated with the calculated exclusion of the Albanian Workers Party from the congress as a fraternal delegate, followed up by a whole series of attacks and resulting in the demonstrative withdrawal of Chinese Premier Chou En-Lai, is also of primary importance. It sounded the shattering of the Stalinist monolith.

Delegates from 24 CP's, including the Canadian CP, failed to vote for Khrushchov's demand that Albania be ousted from the world Communist movement. Two weeks later nine Communist parties, China, North Vietnam, North Korea, India, Burma, Malaya, Thailand, Belgium, along with Australia and New Zealand, sent greetings to Hoxha on the 20th anniversary of the Albanian CP.

Whereas the Chinese CP along with all the rest of the CP's of the world, have been denying the existence of any divisions in their ranks, now Peking is publishing editorials from the Albanian press denouncing Khrushchov. Hoxha has replied in his speech on November 7 with a challenge that Khrushchov through his concept of "peaceful coexistence," has abandoned the struggle against imperialism, and in his attack on the Albanian party calling for the overthrow of its leadership and its liquidation, has conducted himself in such a way as "he refrains from doing even in the case of the governments of capitalist countries."

He pinpoints how the Soviet government cut all loans, withdrew all Soviet specialists and even deprived Albanians studying in the Soviet Union of their scholarships, etc., etc. In response to the charge of the prevalence of the Stalin cult in Albania, Hoxha countercharges that in the CPSU the Stalin cult has been replaced with a Khrushchov cult, and replies to the nouveau defenders of Soviet democracy: "It would be better for you to look into your own affairs because it is not in the Albanian Workers Party but in your parties that several examples exist of scandalous violations of the most elementary rules of democracy."

Thus the 22nd Congress reopens on a much more extensive and more profound basis the discussions in the international working class movement that the 20th congress provoked five years ago.

Khrushchov's revelations of the crimes of Stalin to the 20th congress were never published in the Soviet press and were known to the Soviet masses only by hearsay. While he exposed other trials and convictions as frame-ups, at that time he only implied that the infamous Moscow confession trials of the 30's were frame-ups. But the delegates to the 22nd Congress heard Khrushchov go into detail on the 1934 assassination of Kirov which he revealed was in all probability engineered by Stalin himself and which served as the pretext for the staging of the Moscow Trials.

These trials saw the frame-up and destruction of Lenin's closest co-workers such as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, with Trotsky in absentia cast in the key role, as agents of Hitler and the Mikado. They served as the prelude to mass purges that sent millions to the firing squads and concentration camps.

In his keynote speech in which for the first time in public was added Marshal Vorishilov to the list of "anti-party group" leaders, Khrushchov declared "they bear personal responsibility for mass repressions against party, government, economic, military and Communist youth officials and for similar phenomena during the period of the cult of personality."

Shelepin, chairman of the Soviet State Security Committee, queried "You sometimes wonder how these people could calmly walk the earth and sleep in peace. They must have been plagued by nightmares. They must have heard the sobs and curses of mothers, wives and children of their innocently condemned comrades."

It is true that the members of the "anti-party group" are all stained with Stalin's crimes but crimes of such magnitude required the collaboration of not just Molotov and Vorishilov but entire branches of the party and government which included Khrushchov and all his principal supporters. All rose within the bureaucracy under Stalin and could do so only by collaborating in the terror and frame-up by which they, with Stalin at their head, ruled.

Thus Kaganovich, now expelled for his crimes in the Ukraine brought Khrushchov into the Moscow party hierarchy. Malenkov, who after Stalin's death made the first essay to restore "socialist legality" (i.e. curbing the secret police) and increase consumers' goods production, was ousted by a coalition in which Khrushchov played a leading role in the name of preserving the good old (Stalin) policies.

Can Khrushchov's claim that Molotov and company obstructed his promise made five years ago to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Kirov assassination be taken seriously; when they were all expelled from positions of leadership four years ago? The self-proclaimed guardian of the CPSU's new freedom, who boasts of handling the "anti-party group" by ideological methods didn't use such methods to meet the forces for socialist democracy in Hungary. This congress itself denied Molotov and the senile Vorishilov the right to make their own case. It is no accident that they have not been put on the dock for a full investigation of their part in the crimes. For they would implicate Khrushchov and the whole social strata upon which he rests. Thus we see Stalinism being fought with the methods of Stalinism.

In heaping all the blame for Stalinism on his defeated opponents Khrushchov hopes to erase his own reprehensible record from popular memory. While the Soviet masses joyfully accept the blows he now delivers against the Stalin cult and proven participants in its crimes it is unlikely that they or history will be cajoled into forgetting whence Khrushchov came or what his record was.

STALIN

TROTSKY ON STALIN IN 1937

"First it was deemed that Stlain had emerged victorious owing to the exceptional qualities of his intellect. But when the reflex of the bureacracy became epileptic in character, those who worshipped the "leader" yesterday began asking themselves whether he had not gone mad. Both appraisals are false. Stalin is no "genius".... But neither is Stalin a madman. He was carried to the top by the wave of Thermidor. He came to believe that the source of his power lay in himself. But the caste of parvenus who had proclaimed him genius, disintegrated and corroded within a short space of time. The land of the October revolution is in urgent need of a different political regime. The position of the ruling clique leaves no more room for any rational politics. "Insanity" is located not in Stalin but in the regime which has constantly drained itself. This explanation, however does not contain even a hint of any moral justification of Stalin. He will depart from the scene as the most tarnished figure in mankind's history."

Coyocan, July 5, 1937.

Workers' Vanguard #69 Mid-Nov. 1961

Editorials

It's High Time to Re-think Where Canada Must Stand

BY THE EDITORS

Mid Nov 61

On the one hand we are witness to the revitalization of the Soviet masses wringing from the Khrushchov regime one concession on top of another, and on the march to the establishment of a new era of socialist democracy in their country. On the other hand there is the increasing viciousness of the Salazar dictatorship, the ominous trend towards fascism in France and other countries to which Canada is linked through the many ramifications of the Western alliance, together with the sharpening attack by Canadian capitalism and its representatives on labor at home. Surely these are grounds for a serious re-examination of the basic premises for the international policy that the CLC and the New Democratic Party leadership have imposed on the Canadian working class movement.

Democracy versus totalitarianism! That is the rule of thumb measure that Douglas and Jodoin would have us guide ourselves

(See page 3—TIME TO RE-THINK)

(Continued from page 1)

with in the cross currents of the global conflict. No matter what could have been said for this formula before, what meaning does it have now—now with everything moving so apparently in the reverse order?

Economic democracy, meaningful democracy, these are the slogans under which the NDP has been launched and which project it into struggle against the Liberals and Tories. But democracy versus totalitarianism—it is with that crude formula that the Canadian working class is bound hand and foot to the Liberals and Tories when it comes to foreign policy.

The term democracy isn't adequate to describe the Western bloc. It is a propaganda device to cover over their essential capitalist-imperialist character. Neither does totalitarianism describe the Soviet bloc—rather does it hide their essential character as workers' states.

There are precious elements of democracy in Canada, in the US, in Britain, won at great cost and in struggle against capitalism. There is a monstrous totalitarian regime astride Soviet society. But it is necessary to probe deeper to get to the essence of things and to understand what is happening.

It is necessary to probe beneath the superstructure, to analyze the economic base of Canada and the US, the major component of the Western alliance. They are capitalist to which exploitation, class conflict and imperialism are not by any means some kind of disposable remnant from the 19th century.

And it isn't enough to reject the most crude and obvious anti-Soviet propaganda and then adopt a hands off policy as if the fundamental nature of the Soviet bloc were of concern only to those living there.

The failure of many of the left wing in the NDP to analyze the character of the Soviet regime when it is well known that it rests on a planned economy based on nationalized property has proven a costly matter. It has weakened their capacity to counteract the main argument against a vigorous anti-capitalist program, particularly the concept of public ownership of the basic means of production. Soviet totalitarianism, according to the NPD leadership, flows from nationalization. In order to assure democracy, we are told, we need planning and possibly public ownership, but along with the tempering influence of private ownership—a mixed economy of co-op ownership, public ownership and capitalism.

And so we are witness to the ludicrous spectacle of the NDP leadership identifying democracy with private enterprise—with capitalism.

But totalitarianism is no more indigenous to nationalization than is the bureaucracy typified by Hoffa, Meany and their Canadian vest pocket versions to trade unionism. What we are witness to in the Soviet bloc is a highly contradictory phenomena—one with which NDP activists are vitally concerned from the point of view of finding their way to a correct position on foreign policy—on the key matter of war and peace.

With the ebb of the world revolution and the isolation of the first worker's state, the pressure of world capitalism on it, and its primitive technological and cultural inheritance, a conservative, parasitic bureaucracy arose on Soviet society. With Stalin as its chief spokesman and supreme arbiter, it drove the opposing Bolshevik cadre which had rallied to Trotsky into a corner, murdered it, and by framing it as an agency of a foreign power provided itself with a club with which it could beat and overwhelm future opposition forces.

But the era of defeats has closed. The revolution is no longer isolated. The planned economy is expanding and proving able to meet the needs of the masses who are demanding the egalitarian and humanistic society which was the aim of the revolution. They are demanding from those whose chief merit is the fact of their survival, that the heroic opponents of Stalinism be rehabilitated. As it is being driven back the bureaucracy is employing a strategy of striking out here and conceding there.

The worker's party doesn't support or go along with in any way the bosses' and their political agents' struggle against the unions. Nor is it neutral. It doesn't allow itself to be diverted from its position of defence of the unions by the treacherous betrayals of the trade union bureaucracy. Nor can it be indifferent to the struggle of the rank and file against this bureaucracy.

The forces must be mobilized to break the NDP from its policy of support of the NATO alliance which certainly is nuclear armed. The NDP must cease supporting the war mongering anti-Soviet cabal. Nor can it break only to assume a position of neutrality in the conflict. Certainly the entire left cannot afford to be indifferent to the inspiring developments in the Soviet Union today. Stalinism has been a terrible blight on the making of the case for socialism amongst the Canadian working class. Its defeat will do much to clear the road ahead.

World capitalism is startled and dismayed by the re-entry of the Soviet peoples onto the political arena. The concessions that Khrushchov is making under their pressure is tearing aside the myth of a subject people awaiting liberation from the West. These developments must strengthen the hand of those forces in the NDP who seek to win the NDP to a foreign policy which will identify it with every past conquest of the world working class and aid and encourage future ones in the direction of a socialist world

Workers' Vanguard #69 Mid-Nov. 1961

Editorials

It's High Time to Re-think Where Canada Must Stand

BY THE EDITORS

M.-N. Nov '61

On the one hand we are witness to the revitalization of the Soviet masses wringing from the Khrushchov regime one concession on top of another, and on the march to the establishment of a new era of socialist democracy in their country. On the other hand there is the increasing viciousness of the Salazar dictatorship, the ominous trend towards fascism in France and other countries to which Canada is linked through the many ramifications of the Western alliance, together with the sharpening attack by Canadian capitalism and its representatives on labor at home. Surely these are grounds for a serious re-examination of the basic premises for the international policy that the CLC and the New Democratic Party leadership have imposed on the Canadian working class movement.

Democracy versus totalitarianism! That is the rule of thumb measure that Douglas and Jodoin would have us guide ourselves

(See page 3—TIME TO RE-THINK)

(Continued from page 1)

with in the cross currents of the global conflict. No matter what could have been said for this formula before, what meaning does it have now—now with everything moving so apparently in the reverse order?

Economic democracy, meaningful democracy, these are the slogans under which the NDP has been launched and which project it into struggle against the Liberals and Tories. But democracy versus totalitarianism—it is with that crude formula that the Canadian working class is bound hand and foot to the Liberals and Tories when it comes to foreign policy.

The term democracy isn't adequate to describe the Western bloc. It is a propaganda device to cover over their essential capitalist-imperialist character. Neither does totalitarianism describe the Soviet bloc—rather does it hide their essential character as workers' states.

There are precious elements of democracy in Canada, in the US, in Britain, won at great cost and in struggle against capitalism. There is a monstrous totalitarian regime astride Soviet society. But it is necessary to probe deeper to get to the essence of things and to understand what is happening.

It is necessary to probe beneath the superstructure, to analyze the economic base of Canada and the US, the major component of the Western alliance. They are capitalist to which exploitation, class conflict and imperialism are not by any means some kind of disposable remnant from the 19th century.

And it isn't enough to reject the most crude and obvious anti-Soviet propaganda and then adopt a hands off policy as if the fundamental nature of the Soviet bloc were of concern only to those living there.

The failure of many of the left wing in the NDP to analyze the character of the Soviet regime when it is well known that it rests on a planned economy based on nationalized property has proven a costly matter. It has weakened their capacity to counteract the main argument against a vigorous anti-capitalist program, particularly the concept of public ownership of the basic means of production. Soviet totalitarianism, according to the NPD leadership, flows from nationalization. In order to assure democracy, we are told, we need planning and possibly public ownership, but along with the tempering influence of private ownership—a mixed economy of co-op ownership, public ownership and capitalism.

And so we are witness to the ludicrous spectacle of the NDP leadership identifying democracy with private enterprise—with capitalism.

But totalitarianism is no more indigenous to nationalization than is the bureaucracy typified by Hoffa, Meany and their Canadian vest pocket versions to trade unionism. What we are witness to in the Soviet bloc is a highly contradictory phenomena—one with which NDP activists are vitally concerned from the point of view of finding their way to a correct position on foreign policy—on the key matter of war and peace.

With the ebb of the world revolution and the isolation of the first worker's state, the pressure of world capitalism on it, and its primitive technological and cultural inheritance, a conservative, parasitic bureaucracy arose on Soviet society. With Stalin as its chief spokesman and supreme arbiter, it drove the opposing Bolshevik cadre which had rallied to Trotsky into a corner, murdered it, and by framing it as an agency of a foreign power provided itself with a club with which it could beat and overwhelm future opposition forces.

But the era of defeats has closed. The revolution is no longer isolated. The planned economy is expanding and proving able to meet the needs of the masses who are demanding the egalitarian and humanistic society which was the aim of the revolution. They are demanding from those whose chief merit is the fact of their survival, that the heroic opponents of Stalinism be rehabilitated. As it is being driven back the bureaucracy is employing a strategy of striking out here and conceding there.

The worker's party doesn't support or go along with in any way the bosses' and their political agents' struggle against the unions. Nor is it neutral. It doesn't allow itself to be diverted from its position of defence of the unions by the treacherous betrayals of the trade union bureaucracy. Nor can it be indifferent to the struggle of the rank and file against this bureaucracy.

The forces must be mobilized to break the NDP from its policy of support of the NATO alliance which certainly is nuclear armed. The NDP must cease supporting the war mongering anti-Soviet cabal. Nor can it break only to assume a position of neutrality in the conflict. Certainly the entire left cannot afford to be indifferent to the inspiring developments in the Soviet Union today. Stalinism has been a terrible blight on the making of the case for socialism amongst the Canadian working class. Its defeat will do much to clear the road ahead.

World capitalism is startled and dismayed by the re-entry of the Soviet peoples onto the political arena. The concessions that Khrushchov is making under their pressure is tearing aside the myth of a subject people awaiting liberation from the West. These developments must strengthen the hand of those forces in the NDP who seek to win the NDP to a foreign policy which will identify it with every past conquest of the world working class and aid and encourage future ones in the direction of a socialist world

The Workers
Vanguard

Mid-December 1961 Vol. 6, No. (10) (70) 23 Toronto—Price 5 cents

Oshawa Victory Boosts Ford & Chrysler Workers

By P. KENT

Ford and Chrysler workers, in negotiations with the auto bosses since early last October, have been strengthened by the victory scored against General Motors.

The three day strike, launched by an unauthorized walkout 61 hours before the Dec. 10 midnight deadline when 2,000 pickets appeared outside 25 gates of the sprawling Oshawa plant, and then spread to London, St. Kits, Toronto and Windsor plants, brought the GM colussus to heel. As Canadian director Burt put it the company "got their answer quicker from the workers than they did from the negotiating committee."

Negotiations which were opened and stalemated from Sept. 12 on, and which saw the company attempt to go over the tops of the union to deal directly with the rank and file, were highlighted by an unauthorized walkout on Dec. 1 of 6,000 production workers whose refusal to work overtime forced the company to cancel overtime on the night shift. The autoworkers followed their traditional policy of merely going through the motions of conforming to the compulsory conciliation procedures.

The final settlement, while not matching the fighting capacity of the autoworkers, forced the company to top its pre-strike offer which was a virtual carbon copy of the U.S. settlement. The union signed a lengthy three year pact with an annual 6 cent increase, but won almost complete retroactivity and forced the company to accept full payment of the hospital and medical plan, and to concede an increased pension supplement.

The Ford workers at Oakville and Windsor, who have had 30 meetings with the company with no concessions on monetary or pension proposals, have cast a strike ballot of over 98% and will be setting a strike deadline early in January.

JUST FINE

"Looks good," said A. F. MacArthur when asked how the unemployment outlook for the coming winter compared to last year's level.

To ease the situation in Toronto, he said, National Employment Service plans to build two new office buildings and anticipates increasing its staff. "The buildings would cost several million dollars" and the anticipated staff increase would be 10 per cent of the approximately 500 persons NES now employs in Metro, he said.

It looks like ex-trade union porkchopper and now labor advisor to the Tories, MacArthur, has found the perfect solution. Use unemployed to build more buildings to house the expanding needs of NES which will hire more unemployed to interview the unemployed, ad infinitum.

WV #70 Mid-Dec. 1961

Editorials

Protest This Proscription of the Vanguard & Press!

BY THE EDITORS

Mid DEC '61

Extract from a circular letter to all NDP units in British Columbia, dated Dec. 6th, 1961.

"I wish to draw to your attention a directive of the provincial executive as passed by resolution at its meeting on November 18th. It states that "distribution of **The Vanguard** or of **The Press** by a member of the Party is regarded as grounds for expulsion."

Here, is the antithesis of that "democratic movement financed and controlled by the membership," on which so much emphasis is laid in official brochures of the party. "Democracy"—if it is to have meaning at all in the NDP—must implicitly and explicitly include the right to free expression and circulation of ideas and policies consistent with the implied or stated aim of the party. Such ideas may not, at a given moment, be those of the majority but they **must have the right to circulate and compete** for majority support, otherwise the organization must be condemned to frustration, sterility and decay.

The Vanguard has been unstinting in its support of the NDP—but not uncritical of projected policy, program or of individuals.

(See page 3—
DEFEND DEMOCRACY)

THE WORKERS' VANGUARD

Published monthly by The Workers' Vanguard Publishing Assoc.
81 Queen Street West, Toronto 1, Ont. — EM. 6-1454
EDITOR—ROSS DOWSON Subscriptions 50c a year (12 issues)

The policy of The Workers Vanguard is reflected in its editorials. Signed articles and features express the ideas of our contributors and do not necessarily represent the policies or opinion of The Workers' Vanguard.

Set up and printed by Merchants Press, 323 King St. W., Toronto
Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash.

Defend Democracy in NDP!

(Continued from Page 1)

Its editorial line and the contributions of its correspondents present a systematic body of political views entertained by many members of the NDP.

Press is a monthly publication put out in B.C. by a co-operating group of individuals. By editorial declaration it is not committed to any systematic views but is a symposium, a forum, in which the thinking of socialists on any topic may be expressed and circulated.

It is highly unlikely that the contributors, supporters or readers of these journals will meekly bow to this ill-considered directive. Nor is it thinkable that the B.C. membership of the NDP would permit the retention of such a shackle upon the democratic rights of the individual within the young party on which the hopes of the Canadian working class ride. Our readers are invited to express what they think of this outrage and send it to us; to the editors of Press; and to the B.C. provincial executive of the NDP.

Mid- DEC 61

Implement Convention Policy!

Through the voice of Dr. Keyston, vice-chairman of the Defence Research Board, who, breaching the traditional silence of civil servants, is advocating immediate nuclear armament of Canadian forces as part of NATO, the Diefenbaker government is flying a kite. It is testing the winds again for new possibilities, new openings, in the hope that it can end its manoeuvrings and openly equip Canadian forces committed to NATO with nuclear arms.

Diefenbaker has good grounds for believing that there is a change in the prevailing anti-nuclear arms winds, if only from scanning the speeches of New Democratic Party leader T. C. Douglas.

Douglas was elected to leadership of the party at a convention which without any equivocation whatsoever opposed nuclear arms on Canadian soil and in the hands of Canadian forces, and committed him, should NATO forces become nuclear armed, to lead a campaign to withdraw Canada out of the alliance.

Everyone knows, Mr. Douglas knows—in fact he told a Toronto meeting that you'd have to be "pretty naive" not to know—that the government is committed to accepting nuclear arms. But Mr. Douglas, who more than anyone is responsible for popularizing the party's program, hasn't made a move to mobilize the Canadian people against the nuclear arms drive.

To be sure he has been making some powerful speeches—threatening to galvanize the entire resources of the party, to rally the Canadian people — against war over Berlin. But even those who were roused to their feet, when they had a chance to sit back and think must have realized that no one, certainly not those responsible for the policy of any major power, is prepared to go to war over Berlin. Macmillian brushed it aside as a scare manufactured by the press.

Mr. Douglas has been heaping scorn on the Tory government's civil defence campaign "as giving the people a false sense of security." But after exposing this campaign which is designed to prepare the Canadian people to accept the concept of a nuclear war, he ends up by supporting its fundamental purpose by demanding that the government develop it into a "shelters for everybody" program, a national public shelter program.

The truth is that as Canada and NATO move steadily towards nuclear armament, instead of laying the grounds for a national campaign for withdrawal, Mr. Douglas has become an attorney for the defence of this threatening military alliance.

Before the U of T student parliament Douglas made a positive defence of NATO. "We should stay in NATO until the UN has a permanent police force," he said—the UN is "not doing enough to keep the peace," he said, a la Diefenbaker.

Only through its pledge to break from NATO which is based on a nuclear strategy, should it become nuclear armed, can the New Democratic Party claim to have a policy in any way different from the parties of Capital on the key question of war or peace.

By his failure to mobolize the forces of the party to seriously implement its policy as determined in convention, Mr. Douglas is undermining the entire democratic structure of the party, its unity and its cohesiveness, which depends upon the leadership implementing the decisions of the membership. By his failure to give voice to the position of the party, by his becoming an attorney for the defence of the NATO military alliance, he is aiding and abetting Diefenbaker in his preparations to nuclear arm Canadian forces and is betraying those who have indentified all their hopes for a world of peace and plenty in the NDP.

It's time for the NDP clubs to intervene in this situation and put things right. The protests voiced against NDP M.P. Douglas Fisher by the Hull section for his arrogant attack on French Canadian culture are highly in order. And it is even more pressing to call M.P. Harold Winch to order (see letters to the editor) and Mr. Douglas himself.